

School of Theology at Claremont



10017003934



The Library
of the
CLAREMONT

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

Geesenius, Friedrich Heinrich Wilhelm
GESENIUS'

HEBREW GRAMMAR

Hebraische grammatik

AS EDITED AND ENLARGED BY THE LATE

E. KAUTZSCH

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE

PJ
4564
G413
1910

SECOND ENGLISH EDITION

REVISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TWENTY-EIGHTH GERMAN

EDITION (1909) BY

A. E. COWLEY

WITH A FACSIMILE OF THE SILOAM INSCRIPTION BY J. EUTING, AND

A TABLE OF ALPHABETS BY M. LIDZBARSKI

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1910

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK
TORONTO AND MELBOURNE

12-668

PRINTED IN ENGLAND.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

THE translation of the twenty-sixth German edition of this grammar, originally prepared by the Rev. G. W. Collins and revised by me, was published in 1898. Since that date a twenty-seventh German edition has appeared; and Prof. Kautzsch was already engaged on a twenty-eighth in 1908 when the English translation was becoming exhausted. He sent me the sheets as they were printed off, and I began revising the former translation in order to produce it as soon as possible after the completion of the German. The whole of the English has been carefully compared with the new edition, and, it is hoped, improved in many points, while Prof. Kautzsch's own corrections and additions have of course been incorporated. As before, the plan and arrangement of the original have been strictly followed, so that the references for sections and paragraphs correspond exactly in German and English. Dr. Driver has again most generously given up time, in the midst of other engagements, to reading the sheets, and has made numerous suggestions. To him also are chiefly due the enlargement of the index of subjects, some expansions in the new index of Hebrew words, and some additions to the index of passages, whereby we hope to have made the book more serviceable to students. I have also to thank my young friend, Mr. Godfrey R. Driver, of Winchester College, for some welcome help in correcting proofs of the Hebrew index and the index of passages. בן חכם ישמח אב. Many corrections have been sent to me by scholars who have used the former English edition, especially the Rev. W. E. Blomfield, the Rev. S. Holmes, Mr. P. Wilson, Prof. Witton Davies, Mr. G. H. Skipwith, and an unknown correspondent

at West Croydon. These, as well as suggestions in reviews, have all been considered, and where possible, utilized. I am also much indebted to the Press-readers for the great care which they have bestowed on the work.

Finally, I must pay an affectionate tribute to the memory of Prof. Kautzsch, who died in the spring of this year, shortly after finishing the last sheets of the twenty-eighth edition. For more than thirty years he was indefatigable in improving the successive editions of the Grammar. The German translation of the Old Testament first published by him in 1894, with the co-operation of other scholars, under the title *Die Heilige Schrift des A Ts*, and now (1910) in the third and much enlarged edition, is a valuable work which has been widely appreciated: the *Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A Ts*, edited by him in 1900, is another important work: besides which he published his *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* in 1884, two useful brochures *Bibelwissenschaft und Religionsunterricht* in 1900, and *Die bleibende Bedeutung des A Ts* in 1903, six popular lectures on *Die Poesie und die poetischen Bücher des A Ts* in 1902, his article 'Religion of Israel' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. (1904), pp. 612-734, not to mention minor publications. His death is a serious loss to Biblical scholarship, while to me and to many others it is the loss of a most kindly friend, remarkable alike for his simple piety and his enthusiasm for learning.

A. C.

MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD,

Sept. 1910.

FROM THE GERMAN PREFACE

THE present (twenty-eighth) edition of this Grammar,¹ like the former ones, takes account as far as possible of all important new publications on the subject, especially J. Barth's *Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Semitischen*, pt. i, Lpz. 1907; the important works of C. Brockelmann (for the titles see the heading of § 1; vol. i of the *Grundriss* was finished in 1908); P. Kahle's *Der masoretische Text des A Ts nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden*, Lpz. 1902 (giving on p. 51 ff. an outline of Hebrew accidence from a Babylonian MS. at Berlin); R. Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, Lpz. 1905 f., 2 vols. (discriminating between certain, probable, and proposed emendations; see § 3 g, end); Th. Nöldeke's *Beiträge zur semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, Strassburg, 1904; Ed. Sievers' *Metrische Studien* (for the titles of these striking works see § 2 r). The important work of J. W. Rothstein, *Grundzüge des hebr. Rhythmus*, &c. (see also § 2 r), unfortunately appeared too late to be used. The two large commentaries edited by Nowack and Marti have been recently completed; and in P. Haupt's Polychrome Bible (*SBOT.*), part ix (Kings) by Stade and Schwally was published in 1904.

For full reviews of the twenty-seventh edition, which of course have been considered as carefully as possible, I have to thank Max Margolis (in *Hebraica*, 1902, p. 159 ff.), Mayer

¹ The first edition appeared at Halle in 1813 (202 pp. small 8vo); twelve more editions were published by W. Gesenius himself, the fourteenth to the twenty-first (1845-1872) by E. Rödiger, the twenty-second to the twenty-eighth (1878-1910) by E. Kautzsch. The first abridged edition appeared in 1896, the second at the same time as the present (twenty-eighth) large edition. The first edition of the 'Übungsbuch' (Exercises) to Gesenius-Kautzsch's Hebrew Grammar appeared in 1881, the sixth in 1908.

Lambert (*REJ.* 1902, p. 307 ff.), and H. Oort (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1902, p. 373 ff.). For particular remarks and corrections I must thank Prof. J. Barth (Berlin), Dr. Gasser, pastor in Buchberg, Schaffhausen, B. Kirschner, of Charlottenburg, (contributions to the index of passages), Pastor Köhler, of Augst, Dr. Liebmann, of Kuczkow, Posen, Prof. Th. Nöldeke, of Strassburg, Pastor S. Preiswerk junior, of Bâle, Dr. Schwarz, of Leipzig, and Prof. B. Stade, of Giessen (died in 1906). Special mention must be made of the abundant help received from three old friends of this book, Prof. P. Haupt, of Baltimore, Prof. Knudtson, of Kristiania, and Prof. H. Strack, of Berlin, and also, in connexion with the present edition, Prof. H. Hyvernât, of the University of Washington, who has rendered great service especially in the correction and enlargement of the indexes. I take this opportunity of thanking them all again sincerely. And I am no less grateful also to my dear colleague Prof. C. Steuernagel for the unwearied care with which he has helped me from beginning to end in correcting the proof-sheets.

Among material changes introduced into this edition may be mentioned the abolition of the term *šewâ medium* (§ 10 d). In this I have adopted, not without hesitation, the views of Sievers. I find it, however, quite impossible to follow him in rejecting all distinctions of quantity in the vowels. It is no doubt possible that such matters may in the *spoken* language have worn a very different appearance, and especially that in the period of nearly a thousand years, over which the Old Testament writings extend, very great variations may have taken place. Our duty, however, is to represent the language in the form in which it has been handed down to us by the Masoretes; and that this form involves a distinction between unchangeable, tone-long, and short vowels, admits in my opinion of no doubt. The discussion of any earlier stage of development belongs not to Hebrew grammar but to comparative Semitic philology.

The same answer may be made to Beer's desire (*ThLZ.* 1904,

col. 314f.) for an 'historical Hebrew grammar describing the actual growth of the language on a basis of comparative philology, as it may still be traced within the narrow limits of the Old Testament'. Such material as is available for the purpose ought indeed to be honestly set forth in the new editions of Gesenius; but Beer seems to me to appraise such material much too highly when he refers to it as necessitating an 'historical grammar'. In my opinion these historical differences have for the most part been obliterated by the harmonizing activity of the Masoretes.

.

E. KAUTZSCH.

HALLE,
July, 1909.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Page 42, line 13 from below, *for* note 1 *read* note 3.

Page 63, § 15 *p.* [See also Wickes, *Prose Accentuation*, 130 f., 87 *n.* (who, however, regards the superlinear, Babylonian system as the earlier); and Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, 76, 78. In Ginsburg's *Hebrew Bible*, ed. ■ (1908), pp. 108 f., 267 f., the two systems of division are printed *in extenso*, in parallel columns—the 10 verses of the superlinear (Babylonian) system consisting (in Exodus) of v. 2.3-6.7.8-11.12.13.14.15.16.17 (as numbered in ordinary texts), and the 12 verses of the sublinear (Palestinian) system, consisting of v. 2-3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10.11.12.13-16.17.—S. R. D.]

Page 65, note 1, *for* נָנָן read נָנָן (as § 105 *a*).

[Editions often vary in individual passages, as regards the accentuation of the first syllable: but in the 7 occurrences of נָנָן, and the 6 of נָנָן, Baer, Ginsburg, and Kittel agree in having an accent on both syllables (as נָנָן) in Gn 50¹⁷, Ex 32³¹, ψ 116¹⁶, and Metheg on the first syllable and an accent on the second syllable (as נָנָן) in 2 K 20³=Is 38³, Jon 1¹⁴, 4², ψ 116⁴, 118^{25.25}, Dn 9⁴, Ne 1^{5.11}, except that in ψ 116⁴ Ginsburg has נָנָן.—S. R. D.]

Page 79, § 22 *s*, *before* הִיִּדְּיָהוּ *insert* exceptions to *b* are. *After* Jer 39¹² *add* ψ 52⁵; *and for* Ez 9⁶ *read* Ezr 9⁶.

[So Baer (cf. his note on Jud 20⁴³; also on Jer 39¹², and several of the other passages in question): but Ginsburg only in 10 of the exceptions to *b*, and Jacob ben Hayyim and Kittel only in 5, viz. Jer 39¹², Pr 11²¹, 15¹, ψ 52⁵, Ezr 9⁶.—S. R. D.]

Page 111, line 12, *for* הָהוּה *read* הָהוּה.

Page 123, § 45 *e*, *add*: cf. also מְהִפֵּחַ followed by אַת, Is 13¹⁹, Am 4¹¹ (§ 115 *d*).

Page 175, § 67. See B. Halper, 'The Participial formations of the Geminate Verbs' in *ZA W.* 1910, pp. 42 ff., 99 ff., 201 ff. (also dealing with the regular verb).

Page 177, at the end of § 67 *g* the following paragraph has been accidentally omitted:

Rem. According to the prevailing view, this strengthening of the first radical is merely intended to give the bi-literal stem at least

■ tri-literal appearance. (Possibly aided by the analogy of verbs פ"ן, as P. Haupt has suggested to me in conversation.) But cf. Kautzsch, 'Die sog. aramaisierenden Formen der Verba ע"ע im Hebr.' in *Oriental. Studien zum 70. Geburtstag Th. Nöldekes*, 1906, p. 771 ff. It is there shown (1) that the sharpening of the 1st radical often serves to emphasize a particular meaning (cf. יָפַר, but יִנְרְהוּ, יַחַל and יַחַל, יָפַב and יָכַב, יָשַׁם and יָשַׁם), and elsewhere no doubt to dissimilate the vowels (as יָפַר, יָדַל, never יָפַר, יָדַל, &c.): (2) that the sharpening of the 1st radical often appears to be occasioned by the nature of the first letter of the stem, especially when it is a sibilant. Whether the masoretic pronunciation is based on an early tradition, or the Masora has arbitrarily adopted aramaizing forms to attain the above objects, must be left undecided.

Page 193, the second and third paragraphs should have the marginal letters *d* and *e* respectively.

Page 200, § 72 z, line 2, after Est 2¹⁸ add 4¹⁴.

Page 232, § 84^a s, add שִׁמְמָה 2 S 13²⁰.

Page 236, § 85 c, add הַנִּזְקָה Ezr 4²².

Page 273, § 93 qq end, add מוֹסְרוֹת Jer 5⁵, רַבְעִים, שְׁלִשִּׁים Ez 20⁵, שִׁמְמוֹת Is 49⁸, שִׁמְמִים La 1¹⁶ (cf. König, ii. 109).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations have occasionally been used for works and periodicals frequently quoted:—

- AJSL.* = American Journal of Semitic Languages.
CIS. = Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.
Ed. Mant. = Biblia Hebraica ex recensione Sal. Norzi edidit Raphael Hayyim Basila, Mantuae 1742-4.
Jabl. = Biblia Hebraica ex recensione D. E. Jablonski, Berolini, 1699.
JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review.
*KAT.*³ = Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, 3rd ed. by H. Zimmern and H. Winckler, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902 f.
Lexicon = A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, Oxford, 1906.
NB. = J. Barth, Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. Lpz. 1889-94.
NGGW. = Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.
OLZ. = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. Vienna, 1898 ff.
PRE. = Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3rd ed. by A. Hauck. Lpz. 1896 ff.
PSBA = Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology. London, 1879 ff.
REJ. = Revue des Études Juives. Paris, 1880 ff.
Sam. = The (Hebrew) Pentateuch of the Samaritans.
SBOT. = Sacred Books of the Old Testament, ed. by P. Haupt. Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff.
ThLZ. = Theologische Literaturzeitung, ed. by E. Schürer. Lpz. 1876 ff.
VB. = Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, ed. by A. Jeremias and H. Winckler. Lpz. 1907 ff.
ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete, ed. by C. Bezold. Lpz. 1886 ff.
ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by B. Stade, Giessen, 1881 ff., and since 1907 by K. Marti.
ZDMG. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Lpz. 1846 ff., since 1903 ed. by A. Fischer.
ZDPV. = Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinaverains, Lpz. 1878 ff., since 1903 ed. by C. Steuernagel.

[illegible]

[חם]. הנקבה. וזה. היה. דבר. הנקבה. בעוד...
 הנהו. איש. אל. רעו. ובעוד. שלש. אמת. להנ[קב]. קל. איש. ק.
 רא. אל. רעו. כי. הית. וזה. בצר. מימן... ובים. ה.
 נקבה. הכו. החצבם. איש. לקרת. רעו. גרין. על. גרין. וילכו
 המים. מן. המוצא. אל. הברכה. במאתים. ואלף. אמה. ומ(א)
 ת. אמה. היה. גבה. הצר. על. ראש. החצב[ם]

Rem.—Line 1 probably began with **בן**, cf. § 145 o, since there is hardly room for **היה**.

Line 2. The reading לְהַנִּיחַ is supported by the fact that a trace of the top of the ך is visible; cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 53. The next word was probably, as

P. Haupt suggests, **נשׁוּן**, the imperf. consec. Qal or Niph'al.

Line 3. וְיָרַח , not found in the Old Testament, most probably means a *cleft, crack*, but the etymology and consequently the pronunciation of it [וְיָרַח] are still doubtful.



THE SILOAM INSCRIPTION. From Müller-Benzinger, *Landchaftsbilder* (H. Grund : Berlin).

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x
TABLE OF EARLY SEMITIC ALPHABETS	
SILAM INSCRIPTION	

INTRODUCTION

§	1. The Semitic Languages in General	1
§	2. Sketch of the History of the Hebrew Language	8
§	3. Grammatical Treatment of the Hebrew Language	17
§	4. Division and Arrangement of the Grammar	22

FIRST PART

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES, OR THE SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

CHAPTER I. THE INDIVIDUAL SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

§	5. The Consonants: their Forms and Names	24
§	6. Pronunciation and Division of Consonants	31
§	7. The Vowels in General, Vowel Letters and Vowel Signs	35
§	8. The Vowel Signs in particular	39
§	9. Character of the several Vowels	45
§	10. The Half Vowels and the Syllable Divider (Šewâ)	51
§	11. Other Signs which affect the Reading	54
§	12. Dageš in general, and Dageš forte in particular	55
§	13. Dageš lene	56
§	14. Mappiq and Rāphè	56
§	15. The Accents	57
§	16. Of Maqqēph and Methēg	63
§	17. Of the Q'rê and K'ethîbh. Masora marginalis and finalis	65

CHAPTER II. PECULIARITIES AND CHANGES OF LETTERS: THE SYLLABLE AND THE TONE

§	18. In general	68
§	19. Changes of Consonants	68
§	20. The Strengthening (Sharpening) of Consonants	70

	PAGE
§ 21. The Aspiration of the Tenuēs	75
§ 22. Peculiarities of the Gutturals	76
§ 23. The Feebleness of the Gutturals <i>א</i> and <i>ה</i>	79
§ 24. Changes of the Weak Letters <i>י</i> and <i>ו</i>	82
§ 25. Unchangeable Vowels	84
§ 26. Syllable-formation and its Influence on the Quantity of Vowels	85
§ 27. The Change of the Vowels, especially as regards Quantity .	88
§ 28. The Rise of New Vowels and Syllables	92
§ 29. The Tone, its Changes, and the Pause	94

SECOND PART

ETYMOLOGY, OR THE PARTS OF SPEECH

§ 30. Stems and Roots; Biliteral, Triliteral, and Quadriliteral .	99
§ 31. Grammatical Structure	103

CHAPTER I. THE PRONOUN

§ 32. The Personal Pronoun. The Separate Pronoun	105
§ 33. Pronominal Suffices	108
§ 34. The Demonstrative Pronoun	109
§ 35. The Article	110
§ 36. The Relative Pronoun	112
§ 37. The Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns	113

CHAPTER II. THE VERB

§ 38. General View	114
§ 39. Ground-form and Derived Stems	114
§ 40. Tenses. Moods. Flexion	117
§ 41. Variations from the Ordinary Form of the Strong Verb . .	118

I. The Strong Verb.

§ 42. In general.	118
---------------------------	-----

A. *The Pure Stem, or Qal.*

§ 43. Its Form and Meaning	118
§ 44. Flexion of the Perfect of Qal	119
§ 45. The Infinitive	122
§ 46. The Imperative	124
§ 47. The Imperfect and its Inflexion	125
§ 48. Shortening and Lengthening of the Imperfect and Imperative. The Jussive and Cohortative	129
§ 49. The Perfect and Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive . . .	132
§ 50. The Participle	136

B. Verba Derivativa, or Derived Conjugations.

PAGE

§ 51. Niph'al	137
§ 52. Pi'el and Pu'al	139
§ 53. Hiph'il and Hoph'al	144
§ 54. Hithpa'el	149
§ 55. Less Common Conjugations	151
§ 56. Quadrilaterals	153

C. Strong Verb with Pronominal Suffixes.

§ 57. In general	154
§ 58. The Pronominal Suffixes of the Verb	155
§ 59. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes	158
§ 60. Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes	160
§ 61. Infinitive, Imperative and Participle with Pronominal Suffixes	162

Verbs with Gutturals.

§ 62. In general	164
§ 63. Verbs First Guttural	165
§ 64. Verbs Middle Guttural	169
§ 65. Verbs Third Guttural	171

II. The Weak Verb.

§ 66. Verbs Primæ Radicalis Nûn (י"ד)	173
§ 67. Verbs י"ע	175

The Weakest Verbs (Verba Quiescentia).

§ 68. Verbs נ"ד	184
§ 69. Verbs י"ד. First Class, or Verbs originally י"ד	186
§ 70. Verbs י"ד. Second Class, or Verbs properly י"ד	192
§ 71. Verbs י"ד. Third Class, or Verbs with Yôdh assimilated	193
§ 72. Verbs י"ע	194
§ 73. Verbs middle i (vulgo י"ע)	202
§ 74. Verbs נ"ל	205
§ 75. Verbs ה"ל	207
§ 76. Verbs Doubly Weak	217
§ 77. Relation of the Weak Verbs to one another	219
§ 78. Verba Defectiva	219

CHAPTER III. THE NOUN

§ 79. General View	221
§ 80. The Indication of Gender in Nouns	222
§ 81. Derivation of Nouns	225
§ 82. Primitive Nouns	225

	PAGE
§ 83. Verbal Nouns in General	226
§ 84 ^a . Nouns derived from the Simple Stem	227
§ 84 ^b . Formation of Nouns from the Intensive Stem	233
§ 85. Nouns with Preformatives and Afformatives	235
§ 86. Denominative Nouns	239
§ 87. Of the Plural	241
§ 88. Of the Dual	244
§ 89. The Genitive and the Construct State	247
§ 90. Real and supposed Remains of Early Case-endings	248
§ 91. The Noun with Pronominal Suffixes	254
§ 92. Vowel Changes in the Noun	260
§ 93. Paradigms of Masculine Nouns	262
§ 94. Formation of Feminine Nouns	275
§ 95. Paradigms of Feminine Nouns	276
§ 96. Nouns of Peculiar Formation	281
§ 97. Numerals. (a) Cardinal Numbers	286
§ 98. Numerals. (b) Ordinal Numbers	292

CHAPTER IV. THE PARTICLES

§ 99. General View	293
§ 100. Adverbs	294
§ 101. Prepositions	297
§ 102. Prefixed Prepositions	298
§ 103. Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes and in the Plural Form	300
§ 104. Conjunctions	305
§ 105. Interjections	307

THIRD PART

SYNTAX

CHAPTER I. THE PARTS OF SPEECH

I. Syntax of the Verb.

A. *Use of the Tenses and Moods.*

§ 106. Use of the Perfect	309
§ 107. Use of the Imperfect	313
§ 108. Use of the Cohortative	319
§ 109. Use of the Jussive	321
§ 110. The Imperative	324
§ 111. The Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive	326
§ 112. The Perfect with Wāw Consecutive	330

B. The Infinitive and Participle.

	PAGE
§ 113. The Infinitive Absolute	339
§ 114. The Infinitive Construct	347
§ 115. Construction of the Infinitive Construct with Subject and Object	352
§ 116. The Participles	355

C. The Government of the Verb.

§ 117. The Direct Subordination of the Noun to the Verb as Accusative of the Object. The Double Accusative . .	362
§ 118. The Looser Subordination of the Accusative to the Verb .	372
§ 119. The Subordination of Nouns to the Verb by means of Prepositions	377
§ 120. Verbal Ideas under the Government of a Verb. Co-ordination of Complementary Verbal Ideas	385
§ 121. Construction of Passive Verbs	387

II. Syntax of the Noun.

§ 122. Indication of the Gender of the Noun	389
§ 123. The Representation of Plural Ideas by means of Collectives, and by the Repetition of Words	394
§ 124. The Various Uses of the Plural-Form	396
§ 125. Determination of Nouns in general. Determination of Proper Names	401
§ 126. Determination by means of the Article	404
§ 127. The Noun determined by a following Determinate Genitive .	410
§ 128. The Indication of the Genitive Relation by means of the Construct State	414
§ 129. Expression of the Genitive by Circumlocution	419
§ 130. Wider Use of the Construct State	421
§ 131. Apposition	423
§ 132. Connexion of the Substantive with the Adjective . . .	427
§ 133. The Comparison of Adjectives. (Periphrastic expression of the Comparative and Superlative)	429
§ 134. Syntax of the Numerals	432

III. Syntax of the Pronoun.

§ 135. The Personal Pronoun	437
§ 136. The Demonstrative Pronoun	442
§ 137. The Interrogative Pronoun	443
§ 138. The Relative Pronoun	444
§ 139. Expression of Pronominal Ideas by means of Substantives .	447

CHAPTER II. THE SENTENCE

I. The Sentence in General.

	PAGE
§ 140. Noun-clauses, Verbal-clauses, and the Compound Sentence	450
§ 141. The Noun-clause	451
§ 142. The Verbal-clause	455
§ 143. The Compound Sentence	457
§ 144. Peculiarities in the Representation of the Subject (especially in the Verbal-clause)	459
§ 145. Agreement between the Members of a Sentence, especially between Subject and Predicate, in respect of Gender and Number	462
§ 146. Construction of Compound Subjects	467
§ 147. Incomplete Sentences	469

II. Special Kinds of Sentences.

§ 148. Exclamations	471
§ 149. Sentences which express an Oath or Asseveration	471
§ 150. Interrogative Sentences	473
§ 151. Desiderative Sentences	476
§ 152. Negative Sentences	478
§ 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses	483
§ 154. Sentences connected by Wāw	484
§ 155. Relative Clauses	485
§ 156. Circumstantial Clauses	489
§ 157. Object-clauses (Oratio Obliqua)	491
§ 158. Causal Clauses	492
§ 159. Conditional Sentences	493
§ 160. Concessive Clauses	498
§ 161. Comparative Clauses	499
§ 162. Disjunctive Sentences	500
§ 163. Adversative and Exceptive Clauses	500
§ 164. Temporal Clauses	501
§ 165. Final Clauses	503
§ 166. Consecutive Clauses	504
§ 167. Aposiopesis, Anacoluthon, Involved Series of Sentences	505
PARADIGMS	507
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	533
INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS	544
INDEX OF PASSAGES	565

HEBREW GRAMMAR

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *The Semitic Languages in General.*

B. Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gramm.*, Lpz. 1879, § 2 ff.; E. König, *Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Spr.*, i. Lpz. 1881, § 3; H. Strack, *Einl. in das A. T.*, 6th ed., Munich, 1906, p. 231 ff. (a good bibliography of all the Semitic dialects); Th. Nöldeke, article 'Semitic Languages', in the 9th ed. of the *Encycl. Brit.* (*Die semit. Sprachen*, 2nd ed., Lpz. 1899), and *Beitr. zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb., 1904; W. Wright, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Cambr. 1890; H. Reckendorf, 'Zur Charakteristik der sem. Sprachen,' in the *Actes du X^{me} Congrès internat. des Orientalistes* (at Geneva in 1894), iii. 1 ff., Leiden, 1896; O. E. Lindberg, *Vergl. Gramm. der sem. Sprachen*, i A: Konsonantismus, Gothenburg, 1897; H. Zimmern, *Vergl. Gramm. der sem. Sprachen*, Berlin, 1898; E. König, *Hebräisch und Semitisch: Prolegomena und Grundlinien einer Gesch. der sem. Sprachen*, &c., Berlin, 1901; C. Brockelmann, *Semitische Sprachwissenschaft*, Lpz. 1906, *Grundriss der vergl. Gramm. der sem. Sprachen*, vol. i (Laut- und Formenlehre), parts 1-5, Berlin, 1907 f. and his *Kurzes vergleichende Gramm.* (Porta Ling. Or.) Berlin, 1908.—The material contained in inscriptions has been in process of collection since 1881 in the Paris *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. To this the best introductions are M. Lidzbarski's *Handbuch der Nordsem. Epigraphik*, Weimar, 1898, in 2 parts (text and plates), and his *Ephemeris zur sem. Epigraphik* (5 parts published), Giessen, 1900 f. [G. A. Cooke, *Handbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1903].

1. The Hebrew language is one branch of a great family of languages in Western Asia which was indigenous in Palestine, Phoenicia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Assyria, and Arabia, that is to say, in the countries extending from the Mediterranean to the other side of the Euphrates and Tigris, and from the mountains of Armenia to the southern coast of Arabia. In early times, however, it spread from Arabia over Abyssinia, and by means of Phoenician colonies over many islands and sea-boards of the Mediterranean, as for instance to the Carthaginian coast. No comprehensive designation is found in early times for the languages and nations of this family; the name *Semites* or *Semitic*¹ languages (based upon the fact that according to Gn 10²¹ ff. almost all nations speaking these languages are descended from Shem) is, however, now generally accepted, and has accordingly been retained here.²

¹ First used by Schlözer in Eichhorn's *Repertorium für bibl. u. morgenl. Literatur*, 1781, p. 161.

² From Shem are derived (Gn 10²¹ ff.) the Aramaean and Arab families as well as the Hebrews, but not the Canaanites (Phoenicians), who are traced back to Ham (vv. 6, 15 ff.), although their language belongs decidedly to what is now called Semitic. The language of the Babylonians and Assyrians also was long ago shown to be Semitic, just as Aššur (Gn 10²²) is included among the sons of Shem.

b 2. The better known Semitic languages may be subdivided¹ as follows:—

I. The South Semitic or Arabic branch. To this belong, besides the classical literary language of the Arabs and the modern vulgar Arabic, the older southern Arabic preserved in the Sabaean inscriptions (less correctly called Himyaritic), and its offshoot, the Ge'ez or Ethiopic, in Abyssinia.

II. The Middle Semitic or Canaanitish branch. To this belongs the Hebrew of the Old Testament with its descendants, the New Hebrew, as found especially in the Mishna (see below, § 3 a), and Rabbinic; also Phoenician, with Punic (in Carthage and its colonies), and the various remains of Canaanitish dialects preserved in names of places and persons, and in the inscription of Mēša', king of Moab.

c III. The North Semitic or Aramaic branch. The subdivisions of this are—(1) The Eastern Aramaic or Syriac, the literary language of the Christian Syrians. The religious books of the Mandaeans (Nasoraean, Sabians, also called the disciples of St. John) represent a very debased offshoot of this. A Jewish modification of Syriac is to be seen in the language of the Babylonian Talmud. (2) The Western or Palestinian Aramaic, incorrectly called also 'Chaldee'.² This latter dialect is represented in the Old Testament by two words in Gn 31⁴⁷, by the verse Jer 10¹¹, and the sections Dn 2⁴ to 7²⁸; Ezr 4⁸ to 6¹⁸, and 7¹²⁻²⁶, as well as by a number of non-Jewish inscriptions and Jewish papyri (see below, under *m*), but especially by a considerable section of Jewish literature (Targums, Palestinian Gemara, &c.). To the same branch belongs also the Samaritan, with its admixture of Hebrew forms, and, except for the rather Arabic colouring of the proper names, the idiom of the Nabataean inscriptions in the Sinaitic peninsula, in the East of Palestine, &c.

For further particulars about the remains of Western Aramaic (including those in the New Test., in the Palmyrene and Egyptian Aramaic inscriptions) see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, Lpz. 1884, p. 6 ff.

d IV. The East Semitic branch, the language of the Assyrio-Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions, the third line of the Achaemenian inscriptions.

On the importance of Assyrian for Hebrew philology especially from a lexicographical point of view cf. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen*

¹ For conjectures as to the gradual divergence of the dialects (first the Babylonian, then Canaanite, including Hebrew, lastly Aramaic and Arabic) from primitive Semitic, see Zimmermann, *KAT.*³, ii. p. 644 ff.

² In a wider sense *all* Jewish Aramaic is sometimes called 'Chaldee'.

hebr.-aram. Wörterbuchs zum A. T., Lpz. 1886; P. Haupt, 'Assyrian Phonology, &c.', in *Hebraica*, Chicago, Jan. 1885, vol. i. 3; Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1906.

If the above division into four branches be reduced to two principal groups, No. I, as South Semitic, will be contrasted with the three North Semitic branches.¹

All these languages stand to one another in much the same relation as those of the Germanic family (Gothic, Old Norse, Danish, Swedish; High and Low German in their earlier and later dialects), or as the Slavonic languages (Lithuanian, Lettish; Old Slavonic, Serbian, Russian; Polish, Bohemian). They are now either wholly extinct, as the Phoenician and Assyrian, or preserved only in a debased form, as Neo-Syriac among Syrian Christians and Jews in Mesopotamia and Kurdistan, Ethiopic (Ge'ez) in the later Abyssinian dialects (Tigrê, Tigriña, Amharic), and Hebrew among some modern Jews, except in so far as they attempt a purely literary reproduction of the language of the Old Testament. Arabic alone has not only occupied to this day its original abode in Arabia proper, but has also forced its way in all directions into the domain of other languages.

The Semitic family of languages is bounded on the East and North by another of still wider extent, which reaches from India to the western limits of Europe, and is called Indo-Germanic² since it comprises, in the most varied ramifications, the Indian (Sanskrit), Old and New Persian, Greek, Latin, Slavonic, as well as Gothic and the other Germanic languages. With the Old Egyptian language, of which Coptic is a descendant, as well as with the languages of north-western Africa, the Semitic had from the earliest times much in common, especially in grammatical structure; but on the other hand there are fundamental differences between them, especially from a lexicographical point of view; see Erman, 'Das Verhältniss des Aegyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen,' in the *ZDMG.* xlv, 1892, p. 93 ff., and Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 3.

3. The *grammatical structure* of the Semitic family of languages, as compared with that of other languages, especially the Indo-Germanic, exhibits numerous peculiarities which collectively constitute its distinctive character, although many of them are found singly in other languages. These are—(a) among the consonants, which in fact form the substance of these languages, occur peculiar gutturals of different grades; the vowels are subject, within the same consonantal framework, to great changes in order to express various modifications of the same stem-meaning; (b) the word-stems are almost invariably triliteral, i.e. composed of three consonants; (c) the verb is restricted to two tense-forms, with a peculiarly regulated use; (d) the noun has only two genders (masc. and fem.); and peculiar expedients are adopted for the purpose of indicating the case-relations; (e) the

¹ Hommel, *Grundriss der Geogr. und Gesch. des alten Orients*, Munich, 1904, p. 75 ff., prefers to distinguish them as Eastern and Western Semitic branches. Their geographical position, however, is of less importance than the genealogical relation of the various groups of dialects, as rightly pointed out by A. Jeremias in *Th.LZ.* 1906, col. 291.

² First by Klaproth in *Asia Polyglotta*, Paris, 1823; cf. Leo Meyer in *Nachrichten d. Gött. Gesellschaft*, 1901, p. 454.

oblique cases of the personal pronoun, as well as all the possessive pronouns and the pronominal object of the verb, are denoted by forms appended directly to the governing word (suffixes); (f) the almost complete absence of compounds both in the noun (with the exception of many proper names) and in the verb; (g) great simplicity in the expression of syntactical relations, e.g. the small number of particles, and the prevalence of simple co-ordination of clauses without periodic structure. Classical Arabic and Syriac, however, form a not unimportant exception as regards the last-mentioned point.

- g 4. From a lexicographical point of view also the vocabulary of the Semites differs essentially from that of the Indo-Germanic languages, although there is apparently more agreement here than in the grammar. A considerable number of Semitic roots and stems agree in sound with synonyms in the Indo-Germanic family. But apart from expressions actually borrowed (see below, under i), the real similarity may be reduced to imitative words (onomatopoeica), and to those in which one and the same idea is represented by similar sounds in consequence of a formative instinct common to the most varied families of language. Neither of these proves any *historic* or *generic* relation, for which an agreement in grammatical structure would also be necessary.

Comp. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Studien über indogermanisch-semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft*, Lpz. 1873; Nöldechen, *Semit. Glossen zu Fick und Curtius*, Magdeb. 1876 f.; McCurdy, *Aryo-Semitic Speech*, Andover, U. S. A., 1881. The phonetic relations have been thoroughly investigated by H. Möller in *Semitisch und Indogermanisch*, Teil i, *Konsonanten*, Copenhagen and Lpz. 1907, a work which has evoked considerable criticism.

- h As onomatopoeic words, or as stem-sounds of a similar character, we may compare, e.g. לָקַח, לָחַץ, לָעֵץ, *lingo*, Skt. *lih*, Eng. *to lick*, Fr. *lécher*, Germ. *lecken*; גָּלַל (cf. אָגַל, עָגַל) *culiō*, *volvo*, Germ. *quellen*, *wallen*, Eng. *to well*; גָּרַר, הָרַט, הָרַת, *χαράττω*, Pers. *khāridan*, Ital. *grattare*, Fr. *gratter*, Eng. *to grate*, *to scratch*, Germ. *kratzen*; פָּרַק *frango*, Germ. *brechen*, &c.; Reuss, *Gesch. der hl. Schriften A.T.'s*, Braunsch. 1881, p. 38, draws attention moreover to the Semitic equivalents for *earth*, *six*, *seven*, *horn*, *to sound*, *to measure*, *to mix*, *to smell*, *to place*, *clear*, *to kneel*, *raven*, *goat*, *ox*, &c. An example of a somewhat different kind is *am*, *ham* (*sam*), *gam*, *kam*, in the sense of the German *samt*, *zusammen*, *together*; in Hebrew אָמַם (whence אָמַם *people*, properly *assembly*), עַם (*with*) *samt*, מִם also, moreover, Arab. גָּמַע *to collect*; Pers. *ham*, *hamah* (*at the same time*); Skt. *samā* (*with*), Gk. *ἄμα* (*ἄμφω*), *ὁμός*, *ὁμοῦ* (*ὁμιλος*, *ὁμαδος*), and harder *κοινός*, Lat. *cum*, *cumulus*, *cunctus*; with the corresponding sibilant Skt. *sam*, Gk. *σύν*, *ἔνν*, *ἐννός* = *κοινός*, Goth. *sama*, Germ. *samt*, *sammeln*; but many of these instances are doubtful.

- i Essentially different from this internal connexion is the occurrence of the same words in different languages, where one language has borrowed directly from the other. Such *loan-words* are—

(a) In Hebrew: some names of objects which were originally indigenous in Babylonia and Assyria (see a comprehensive list of Assyrio-Babylonian loan-words in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Old Testament in Zimmern and Winckler, *KAT.*³, ii. p. 648 ff.), in Egypt, Persia, or India, e. g. יָאֵר (also in the plural) *river*, from Egyptian *yoor*, generally as the name of the Nile (late Egypt. *yaro*, Assyr. *yaru'u*), although it is possible that a pure Semitic יָאֵר has been confounded with the Egyptian name of the Nile (so Zimmern); אֶרֶב (Egyptian) Nile-reed (see Lieblein, 'Mots égyptiens dans la Bible,' in *PSBA.* 1898, p. 202 f.); פָּרְדֵּס (in Zend *pairidaēza*, circumvallation = *παράδεισος*) *pleasure garden, park*; אֶרֶבֶן *daric*, Persian gold coin; תְּפִיץ *peacocks*, perhaps from the Malabar *tōgai* or *tōghai*. Some of these words are also found in Greek, as כְּרִפָּס (Pers. *karbās*, Skt. *karpāsa*) *cotton*, κάπρασος, *carbasus*. On the other hand it is doubtful if קֹף corresponds to the Greek κῆπος, κῆβος, Skt. *kapi*, *ape*.

(b) In Greek, &c.: some originally Semitic names of Asiatic products and articles of commerce, e. g. בִּיץ בύσσος, *byssus*; לְבָנָה λίβανος, *libanotós*, *incense*; קָנָה *kánē*, *kánna*, *canna*, *cane*; כֻּמְנוֹן κύμνον, *cuminum*, *cumin*; קַצִּיעָה κασσία, *cassia*; גָּמֶל κάμηλος, *camelus*; עֶרְבֹן ἄρραβόν, *arrhabo*, *arraha*, *pledge*. Such transitions have perhaps been brought about chiefly by Phoenician trade. Cf. A. Müller, 'Semitische Lehnworte im älteren Griechisch,' in Bezzenberger's *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indo-germ. Sprachen*, Göttingen, 1877, vol. i. p. 273 ff.; E. Ries, *Quæ res et vocabula a gentibus semiticis in Graeciam pervenerint*, Breslau, 1890; Muss-Arnolt, 'Semitic words in Greek and Latin,' in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, xxiii. p. 35 ff.; H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griech.*, Berlin, 1895; J. H. Bondi, *Dem hebr.-phöniz. Sprachzweige angehör. Lehnwörter in hieroglyph. u. hieratischen Texten*, Lpz. 1886.

5. No system of writing is ever so perfect as to be able to reproduce *the sounds of a language in all their various shades*, and the *writing of the Semites* has one striking fundamental defect, viz. that only the consonants (which indeed form the substance of the language) are written as real letters,¹ whilst of the vowels only the longer are indicated by certain representative consonants (see below, § 7). It was only later that special small marks (points or strokes below or above the consonants) were invented to represent to the eye all the vowel-sounds (see § 8). These are, however, superfluous for the practised reader, and are therefore often wholly omitted in Semitic manuscripts and printed texts. Semitic writing, moreover, almost invariably proceeds from right to left.²

¹ So also originally the Ethiopic writing, which afterwards represented the vowels by small appendages to the consonants, or by some other change in their form. On the Assyrio-Babylonian cuneiform writing, which likewise indicates the vowels, see the next note, ad fin.

² The Sabæan (Himyaritic) writing runs occasionally from left to right, and even alternately in both directions (*boustrophedon*), but as a rule from right to left. In Ethiopic writing the direction from left to right has become the rule; some few old inscriptions exhibit, however, the opposite direction. The cuneiform writing also runs from left to right, but this is undoubtedly borrowed from a non-Semitic people. Cf. § 5 d, note 3.

With the exception of the Assyrio-Babylonian (cuneiform), all varieties of Semitic writing, although differing widely in some respects, are derived from one and the same original alphabet, represented on extant monuments most faithfully by the characters used on the stele of Mēša', king of Moab (see below, § 2 d), and in the old Phoenician inscriptions, of which the bronze bowls from a temple of Baal (CIS. i. 22 ff. and Plate IV) are somewhat earlier than Mēša'. The old Hebrew writing, as it appears on the oldest monument, the Siloam inscription (see below, § 2 d), exhibits essentially the same character. The old Greek, and indirectly all European alphabets, are descended from the old Phoenician writing (see § 5 i).

l See the Table of Alphabets at the beginning of the Grammar, which shows the relations of the older varieties of Semitic writing to one another and especially the origin of the present Hebrew characters from their primitive forms. For a more complete view, see Gesenius' *Scripturae linguaeque Phoeniciae monumenta*, Lips. 1837, 4to, pt. i. p. 15 ff., and pt. iii. tab. 1-5. From numerous monuments since discovered, our knowledge of the Semitic characters, especially the Phoenician, has become considerably enlarged and more accurate. Cf. the all but exhaustive bibliography (from 1616 to 1896) in Lidzbarski's *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, i. p. 4 ff., and on the origin of the Semitic alphabet, *ibid.*, p. 173 ff., and *Ephemeris* (see the heading of § 1 a above), i. pp. 109 ff., 142, 261 ff., and his 'Altsemitische Texte', pt. i, *Kanaanäische Inschriften* (Moabite, Old-Hebrew, Phoenician, Punic), Giessen, 1907.—On the origin and development of the Hebrew characters and the best tables of alphabets, see § 5 a, last note, and especially § 5 e.

m 6. As regards the relative age of the Semitic languages, the oldest literary remains of them are to be found in the Assyrio-Babylonian (cuneiform) inscriptions,¹ with which are to be classed the earliest Hebrew fragments occurring in the old Testament (see § 2).

The earliest non-Jewish *Aramaic* inscriptions known to us are that of 𐤇𐤁𐤏 king of Hamath (early eighth cent. B.C.), on which see Nöldeke, *ZA.* 1908, p. 376, and that found at Teima, in N. Arabia, in 1880, probably of the fifth cent. B.C., cf. E. Littmann in the *Monist*, xiv. 4 [and Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 195]. The monuments of Kalammus of Sam'al, in the reign of Shalmanezar II, 859-829 B.C. (cf. A. Šanda, *Die Aramäer*, Lpz. 1902, p. 26), and those found in 1888-1891 at Zenjirli in N. Syria, including the Hadad inscription of thirty-four lines (early eighth cent. B.C.) and the Panammu inscription (740 B.C.), are not in pure Aramaic. The Jewish-Aramaic writings begin about the time of Cyrus (cf. *Ezr* 6^{3 ff.}), specially important being the papyri from Assuan ed. by Sayce and Cowley, London, 1906 (and in a cheaper form by Staerk, Bonn, 1907), which are precisely dated from 471 to 411 B.C., and three others of 407 B.C. ed. by Sachau, Berlin, 1907.

¹ According to Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, i. p. 11 ff., the inscriptions found at Nippur embrace the period from about 4000 to 450 B.C.

Monuments of the *Arabic* branch first appear in the earliest centuries A. D. (Sabæan inscriptions, Ethiopic translation of the Bible in the fourth or fifth century, North-Arabic literature from the sixth century A. D.).

It is, however, another question which of these languages has adhered longest and most faithfully to the original character of the Semitic, and which consequently represents to us the earliest phase of its development. For the more or less rapid transformation of the sounds and forms of a language, as spoken by nations and races, is dependent on causes quite distinct from the growth of a literature, and the organic structure of a language is often considerably impaired even before it has developed a literature, especially by early contact with people of a different language. Thus in the Semitic group, the Aramaic dialects exhibit the earliest and greatest decay, next to them the Hebrew-Canaanitish, and in its own way the Assyrian. Arabic, owing to the seclusion of the desert tribes, was the longest to retain the original fullness and purity of the sounds and forms of words.¹ Even here, however, there appeared, through the revolutionary influence of Islam, an ever-increasing decay, until Arabic at length reached the stage at which we find Hebrew in the Old Testament.

Hence the phenomenon, that in its grammatical structure the ancient *Hebrew* agrees more with the modern than with the ancient Arabic, and that the latter, although it only appears as a written language at a later period, has yet in many respects preserved a more complete structure and a more original vowel system than the other Semitic languages, cf. Nöldeke, 'Das klassische Arabisch und die arabischen Dialekte,' in *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 1 ff. It thus occupies amongst them a position similar to that which Sanskrit holds among the Indo-Germanic languages, or Gothic in the narrower circle of the Germanic. But even the toughest organism of a language often deteriorates, at least in single forms and derivatives, while on the contrary, in the midst of what is otherwise universal decay, there still remains here and there something original and archaic; and this is the case with the Semitic languages.

Fuller proof of the above statements belongs to the comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages. It follows, however, from what has been said: (1) that the Hebrew language, as found in the sacred literature of the Jews, has, in respect

¹ Even now the language of some of the Bèdawî is much purer and more archaic than that of the town-Arabs. It must, however, be admitted that the former exalted estimate of the primitiveness of Arabic has been moderated in many respects by the most recent school of Semitic philology. Much apparently original is to be regarded with Nöldeke (*Die semit. Spr.*, p. 5 [= *Encycl. Brit.*, ed. 9, art. SEMITIC LANGUAGES, p. 642]) only as a modification of the original. The assertion that the Arabs exhibit Semitic characteristics in their purest form, should, according to Nöldeke, be rather that 'the inhabitants of the desert lands of Arabia, under the influence of the extraordinarily monotonous scenery and of a life continually the same amid continual change, have developed most exclusively some of the principal traits of the Semitic race'.

to its organic structure, already suffered more considerable losses than the Arabic, which appears much later on the historical horizon; (2) that, notwithstanding this fact, we cannot at once and in all points concede priority to the latter; (3) that it is a mistake to consider with some that the Aramaic, on account of its simplicity (which is only due to the decay of its organic structure), is the oldest form of Semitic speech.

§ 2. Sketch of the History of the Hebrew Language.

See Gesenius, *Gesch. der hebr. Sprache u. Schrift*, Lpz. 1815, §§ 5-18; Th. Nöldeke's art., 'Sprache, hebräische,' in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, Bd. v, Lpz. 1875; F. Buhl, 'Hebräische Sprache,' in Hauck's *Realencycl. für prot. Theol. und Kirche*, vii (1899), p. 506 ff.; A. Cowley, 'Hebrew Language and Literature,' in the forthcoming ed. of the *Encycl. Brit.*; W. R. Smith in the *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii. London, 1901, p. 1984 ff.; A. Lukyn Williams, 'Hebrew,' in *Hastings' Dict. of the Bible*, ii. p. 325 ff., Edinb. 1899.

a 1. The name *Hebrew Language* usually denotes the language of the sacred writings of the Israelites which form the canon of the *Old Testament*. It is also called *Ancient Hebrew* in contradistinction to the New Hebrew of Jewish writings of the post-biblical period (§ 3 a). The name Hebrew language (לְשׁוֹן עִבְרִית ἑβραϊστικὴ ἑβραϊστί) does not occur in the Old Testament itself. Instead of it we find in Is 19¹⁸ the term *language of Canaan*,¹ and יְהוּדִית in the *Jews' language* 2 K 18^{26,28} (cf. Is 36^{11,13}) Neh 13²⁴. In the last-cited passage it already agrees with the later (post-exilic) usage, which gradually extended the name *Jews, Jewish* to the whole nation, as in Haggai, Nehemiah, and the book of Esther.

b The distinction between the names *Hebrew* (עִבְרִי 'Εβραῖοι) and *Israelites* (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) is that the latter was rather a national name of honour, with also a religious significance, employed by the people themselves, while the former appears as the less significant name by which the nation was known amongst foreigners. Hence in the Old Testament *Hebrews* are only spoken of either when the name is employed by themselves as contrasted with foreigners (Gn 40¹⁵, Ex 2^{6 f.} 3¹⁸ &c., Jon 1⁹) or when it is put in the mouth of those who are not Israelites (Gn 39^{14,17} 41¹² &c.) or, finally, when it is used in opposition to other nations (Gn 14¹³ 43³², Ex 2^{11,13} 21²). In 1 S 13³⁻⁷ and 14²¹ the text is clearly corrupt. In the Greek and Latin authors, as well as in Josephus, the name 'Εβραῖοι, *Hebraei*,² &c., alone occurs. Of the many explanations of the gentile עִבְרִי, the derivation from עֵבֶר a country on the other side with the derivative suffix יָ- (§ 86 h) appears to be the only one philologically possible. The name accordingly denoted the Israelites as being those who inhabited the 'eber, i. e. the district on the other side of the Jordan (or according to others the Euphrates), and would therefore originally be only appropriate when used by the nations on this side of the Jordan or Euphrates. We must, then, suppose that after the crossing of the river in question it had been retained by the Abrahamidae as an old-established name, and within certain limits

¹ That Hebrew in its present form was actually developed in Canaan appears from such facts as the use of *yām* (sea) for the west, *nègeb* (properly dryness, afterwards as a proper name for the south of Palestine) for the south.

² The Graeco-Roman form of the name is not directly derived from the Hebrew עִבְרִי, but from the Palestinian Aramaic 'ēbrāyā, 'the Hebrew.'

(see above) had become naturalized among them. In referring this name to the patronymic Eber, the Hebrew genealogists have assigned to it a much more comprehensive signification. For since in Gn 10²¹ (Nu 24²⁴ does not apply) Shem is called the *father of all the children of Eber*, and to the latter there also belonged according to Gn 11¹⁴ ff. and 10²⁵ ff. Aramean and Arab races, the name, afterwards restricted in the form of the gentile 'ibri exclusively to the Israelites, must have originally included a considerably larger group of countries and nations. The etymological significance of the name must in that case not be insisted upon.¹

The term ἑβραϊστί is first used, to denote the old Hebrew, in the prologue C to Jesus the son of Sirach (about 130 B.C.), and in the New Testament, Rv 9¹¹. On the other hand it serves in Jn 5², 19¹³⁻¹⁷ perhaps also in 19²⁰ and Rv 16¹⁶ to denote what was then the (Aramaic) vernacular of Palestine as opposed to the Greek. The meaning of the expression ἑβραϊσὶς διάλεκτος in Acts 21⁴⁰, 22², and 26¹⁴ is doubtful (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 19 f.). Josephus also uses the term *Hebrew* both of the old Hebrew and of the Aramaic vernacular of his time.

The Hebrew language is first called the *sacred language* in the Jewish-Aramaic versions of the Old Testament, as being the language of the sacred books in opposition to the *lingua profana*, i. e. the Aramaic vulgar tongue.

2. With the exception of the Old Testament (and apart from the *d* Phoenician inscriptions; see below, *f-h*), only very few remains of old Hebrew or old Canaanitish literature have been preserved. Of the latter—(1) an inscription, unfortunately much injured, of thirty-four lines, which was found in the ancient territory of the tribe of Reuben, about twelve miles to the east of the Dead Sea, among the ruins of the city of Dibón (now Dîbân), inhabited in earlier times by the Gadites, afterwards by the Moabites. In it the Moabite king Mēâa' (about 850 B.C.) recounts his battles with Israel (cf. 2 K 3⁴ ff.), his buildings, and other matters.² Of old Hebrew: (2) an inscription

¹ We may also leave out of account the linguistically possible identification of the 'Ibriyyim with the Ḥabiri who appear in the Tell-el-Amarna letters (about 1400 B.C.) as freebooters and mercenaries in Palestine and its neighbourhood.

² This monument, unique of its kind, was first seen in August, 1868, on the spot, by the German missionary F. A. Klein. It was afterwards broken into pieces by the Arabs, so that only an incomplete copy of the inscription could be made. Most of the fragments are now in the Louvre in Paris. For the history of the discovery and for the earlier literature relating to the stone, see Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, i. pp. 103 f., 415 f., and in the bibliography (under Me), p. 39 ff. The useful reproduction and translation of the inscription by Smend and Socin (Freiburg in Baden, 1886) was afterwards revised and improved by Nordlander, *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab*, Lpz. 1896; by Socin and Holzinger, 'Zur Mesainschrift' (*Berichte der K. Sächsischen Gesell. d. Wiss.*, Dec. 1897); and by Lidzbarski, 'Eine Nachprüfung der Mesainschrift' (*Ephemeris*, i. 1, p. 1 ff.; text in his *Altsemitische Texte*, pt. 1, Giessen, 1907); J. Halévy, *Revue Sémitique*, 1900, pp. 236 ff., 289 ff., 1901, p. 297 ff.; M. J. Lagrange, *Revue biblique internationale*, 1901, p. 522 ff.; F. Prätorius in *ZDMG.* 1905, p. 33 ff., 1906, p. 402. Its genuineness was attacked by A. Löwy, *Die Echtheit der Moabit. Inschr. im Louvre* (Wien, 1903), and G. Jahn in *Das Buch Daniel*, Lpz. 1904, p. 122 ff. (also in *ZDMG.* 1905, p. 723 ff.), but without justification, as shown by E. König in *ZDMG.* 1905, pp. 233 ff. and 743 ff. [Cf. also Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford, 1890, p. lxxxv ff.; Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 1 ff.]

of six lines (probably of the eighth century B.C.¹) discovered in June, 1880, in the tunnel between the Virgin's Spring and the Pool of Siloam at Jerusalem; (3) about forty engraved seal-stones, some of them pre-exilic but bearing little except proper names²; (4) coins of the Maccabæan prince Simon (from 'the 2nd year of deliverance', 140 and 139 B.C.) and his successors,³ and the coinage of the revolts in the times of Vespasian and Hadrian.

e 3. In the whole series of the ancient Hebrew writings, as found in the Old Testament and also in non-biblical monuments (see above, d), the language (to judge from its consonantal formation) remains, as regards its general character, and apart from slight changes in form and differences of style (see *k* to *w*), at about the same stage of development. In this form, it may at an early time have been fixed as a literary language, and the fact that the books contained in the Old Testament were handed down as *sacred* writings, must have contributed to this constant uniformity.

f To this old Hebrew, the language of the Canaanitish or Phœnician⁴ stocks came the nearest of all the Semitic languages, as is evident partly from the many Canaanitish names of persons and places with a Hebrew form and meaning which occur in the Old Testament (e.g. מַלְכִּי-צֶדֶק, קִרְיַת יִפְּרַי, &c.;

¹ Of this inscription—unfortunately not dated, but linguistically and palaeographically very important—referring to the boring of the tunnel, a facsimile is given at the beginning of this grammar. See also Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, i. 105, 163, 439 (bibliography, p. 56 ff.; facsimile, vol. ii, plate xxi, 1); on the new drawing of it by Socin (*ZDPV*. xxii. p. 61 ff. and separately published at Freiburg i. B. 1899), see Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 53 ff. and 310 f. (text in *Altsemit. Texte*, p. 9 f.). Against the view of A. Fischer (*ZDMG*. 1902, p. 800 f.) that the six lines are the continuation of an inscription which was never executed, see Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, ii. 71. The inscription was removed in 1890, and broken into six or seven pieces in the process. It has since been well restored, and is now in the Imperial Museum at Constantinople. If, as can hardly be doubted, the name יְשֻׁלָּה (i. e. *emissio*) Is 8^e refers to the discharge of water from the Virgin's Spring, through the tunnel (so Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* i. 594), then the latter, and consequently the inscription, was already in existence about 736 B.C. [Cf. Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 15 ff.]

² M. A. Levy, *Siegel u. Gemmen*, &c., Bresl. 1869, p. 33 ff.; Stade, *ZAW*. 1897, p. 501 ff. (four old-Semitic seals published in 1896); Lidzbarski, *Handbuch*, i. 169 f.; *Ephemeris*, i. 10 ff.; W. Nowack, *Lehrb. d. hebr. Archäol.* (Freib. 1894), i. 262 f.; I. Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäol.*² (Tübingen, 1907), pp. 80, 225 ff., which includes the beautiful seal inscribed לשמע עבר ירבעם found from the castle-hill of Megiddo, found in 1904; [Cooke, p. 362].

³ De Sauley, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte*, Par. 1874; M. A. Levy, *Gesch. der jüd. Münzen*, Breslau, 1862; Madden, *The Coins of the Jews*, Lond. 1881; Reinach, *Les monnaies juives*, Paris, 1888.—Cf. the literature in Schürer's *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter J. C.*³, Lpz. 1901, i. p. 20 ff.; [Cooke, p. 352 ff.].

⁴ פִּנְעִי is the native name, common both to the Canaanitish tribes in Palestine and to those which dwelt at the foot of the Lebanon and on the Syrian coast, whom we call Phœnicians, while they called themselves כְּנַעַן on their coins. The people of Carthage also called themselves so.

on 'Canaanite glosses'¹ to Assyrian words in the cuneiform tablets of Tell-el-Amarna [about 1400 B.C.] cf. H. Winckler, 'Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna,' in *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, vol. v, Berlin, 1896 f. [transcription and translation]; J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, Lpz. 1907 f.; H. Zimmern, *ZA.* 1891, p. 154 ff. and *KAT.*³, p. 651 ff.), and partly from the numerous remains of the Phœnician and Punic languages.

The latter we find in their peculiar writing (§ 1 k, l) in a great number of inscriptions and on coins, copies of which have been collected by Gesenius, Judas, Bourgade, Davis, de Vogüé, Levy, P. Schröder, v. Maltzan, Euting, but especially in Part I of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 ff. Among the inscriptions but few public documents are found, e.g. two lists of fees for sacrifices; by far the most are epitaphs or votive tablets. Of special importance is the inscription on the sarcophagus of King Ešmūnazar of Sidon, found in 1855, now in the Louvre; see the bibliography in Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epigr.*, i. 23 ff.; on the inscription, i. 97 ff., 141 f., 417, ii. plate iv, 2; [Cooke, p. 30 ff.]. To these may be added isolated words in Greek and Latin authors, and the Punic texts in Plautus, *Poenulus* 5, 1-3 (best treated by Gildemeister in Ritschl's edition of Plautus, Lips. 1884, tom. ii, fasc. 5). From the monuments we learn the native orthography, from the Greek and Latin transcriptions the pronunciation and vocalization; the two together give a tolerably distinct idea of the language and its relation to Hebrew.

Phœnician (Punic) words occurring in inscriptions are, e.g. אל God, *g* אדם *man*, בן *son*, בת *daughter*, מלך *king*, עבד *servant*, כהן *priest*, זבח *sacrifice*, בעל *lord*, שמש *sun*, ארץ *land*, ים *sea*, אבן *stone*, כסף *silver*, ברזל *iron*, שמן *oil*, עת *time*, קבר *grave*, מצבת *monument*, מקם *place*, משכב *bed*, כל *all*, אחד *one*, עשר *ten*, שבע *seven*, שש *six*, חמש *five*, ארבע *four*, שלש *three*, שנים *two*, כן (=Hebr. היה) *to be*, שמע *to hear*, פתח *to open*, נדר *to vow*, ברך *to bless*, בקש *to seek*, &c. Proper names: צדן *Sidon*, צר *Tyre*, חנא *Hanno*, חנבעל *Hannibal*, &c. See the complete vocabulary in Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epigr.*, i. 204 ff.

Variations from Hebrew in Phœnician orthography and inflection are, *h* e.g. the almost invariable omission of the vowel letters (§ 7 b), as בת for בית *house*, קל for קול *voice*, צדן for צידון *כהנים* *priests*, אלנם (in Plaut. *alonim*) *gods*; the fem., even in the absolute state, ending in ת (*ath*) (§ 80 b) as well as נ (§), the relative אש (Hebr. אשר), &c. The differences in pronunciation are more remarkable, especially in Punic, where the i was regularly pronounced as ū, e.g. שִׁפֶּט *sūfēt* (judge), שָׁלֹשׁ *sālūs* (three), רש *rūs* ראש *head*; i and e often as the obscure dull sound of y, e.g. הַנְּנִי *ynynnu* (ecce eum), אַת (אית) *yth*; the e as o, e.g. מועקר *Mocar* (cf. מַעֲקָה LXX, Gn 22²⁴ Μαχα). See the collection of the grammatical peculiarities in Gesenius, *Monumenta Phœnicia*, p. 430 ff.; Paul Schröder, *Die phöniz. Sprache*, Halle, 1869; B. Stade, 'Erneute Prüfung des zwischen dem Phönice und Hebr. bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades,' in the *Morgenländ. Forschungen*, Lpz. 1875, p. 169 ff.

4. As the Hebrew writing on monuments and coins mentioned *i* in *d* consists only of consonants, so also the writers of the Old

¹ Cf. inter alia: *aparu*, also *ḥaparu* (Assyr. *epru*, *ipru*) = עפר; *ḥullu* = על (with hard e; cf. § 6 c, and Assyr. *ḥumri* = עֲמִירִי, *ḥazzatu* = עָזָה); *iazkur* = יָזַכְר; *zuruḫu* = זָרוּעַ, *abadat* = אֲבָדָה, *šahri* = שַׁעַר, gate; *baṭnu* = בֶּטֶן, belly; *kilūbi* = כְּלִיבִי, net; *šaduk* = צָדִיק (צִדִּיק), &c. [Cf. Böhl, *Die Sprache d. Amarnabriefe*, Lpz. 1909.]

Testament books used merely the consonant-signs (§ 1 *k*), and even now the written scrolls of the Law used in the synagogues must not, according to ancient custom, contain anything more. The present pronunciation of this consonantal text, its vocalization and accentuation, rest on the tradition of the Jewish schools, as it was finally fixed by the system of punctuation (§ 7 *h*) introduced by Jewish scholars about the seventh century A.D.; cf. § 3 *b*.

k An earlier stage in the development of the Canaanitish-Hebrew language, i.e. a form of it anterior to the written documents now extant, when it must have stood nearer to the common language of the united Semitic family, can still be discerned in its principal features:—(1) from many archaisms preserved in the traditional texts, especially in the names of persons and places dating from earlier times, as well as in isolated forms chiefly occurring in poetic style; (2) in general by an *a posteriori* conclusion from traditional forms, so far as according to the laws and analogies of phonetic change they clearly point to an older phase of the language; and (3) by comparison with the kindred languages, especially Arabic, in which this earlier stage of the language has been frequently preserved even down to later times (§ 1 *m, n*). In numerous instances in examining linguistic phenomena, the same—and consequently so much the more certain—result is attained by each of these three methods.

Although the systematic investigation of the linguistic development indicated above belongs to comparative Semitic philology, it is nevertheless indispensable for the scientific treatment of Hebrew to refer to the ground-forms¹ so far as they can be ascertained and to compare the corresponding forms in Arabic. Even elementary grammar which treats of the forms of the language occurring in the Old Testament frequently requires, for their explanation, a reference to these ground-forms.

l 5. Even in the language of the Old Testament, notwithstanding its general uniformity, there is noticeable a certain progress from an earlier to a later stage. Two periods, though with some reservations, may be distinguished: the *first*, down to the end of the Babylonian exile; and the *second*, after the exile.

m To the former belongs, apart from isolated traces of a later revision, the larger half of the Old Testament books, viz. (*a*) of the prose and historical writings, a large part of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; (*b*) of the poetical, perhaps

¹ Whether these can be described simply as 'primitive Semitic' is a question which may be left undecided here.

a part of the Psalms and Proverbs; (c) the writings of the earlier prophets (apart from various later additions) in the following chronological order: Amos, Hosea, Isaiah I, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah (?), Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah II (ch. 40-55).

The beginning of this period, and consequently of Hebrew literature ⁿ generally, is undoubtedly to be placed as early as the time of Moses, although the Pentateuch in its present form, in which very different strata may be still clearly recognized, is to be regarded as a gradual production of the centuries after Moses. Certain linguistic peculiarities of the Pentateuch, which it was once customary to regard as archaisms, such as the epicene use of נָעַר *boy, youth*, for נַעֲרָה *girl*, and הָוָה for הָיָה, are merely to be attributed to a later redactor; cf. § 17 c.

The linguistic character of the various strata of the Pentateuch has been ^O examined by Ryssel, *De Elohista Pentateuchici sermone*, Lpz. 1878; König, *De critica sacrae argumento e linguae legibus repetito*, Lpz. 1879 (analysis of Gn 1-11); F. Giesebrecht, 'Der Sprachgebr. des hexateuchischen Elohisten,' in *ZAW*. 1881, p. 177 ff., partly modified by Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xi. p. 201 ff.; Kräutlein, *Die sprachl. Verschiedenheiten in den Hexateuchquellen*, Lpz. 1908.—Abundant matter is afforded also by Holzinger, *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, Freib. 1893; Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*⁸, Edinburgh, 1908; Strack, *Einleitung ins A. T.*⁶, Munich, 1906; König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, Bonn, 1893.

6. Even in the writings of this first period, which embraces ^p about 600 years, we meet, as might be expected, with considerable differences in linguistic form and style, which are due partly to differences in the time and place of composition, and partly to the individuality and talent of the authors. Thus Isaiah, for example, writes quite differently from the later Jeremiah, but also differently from his contemporary Micah. Amongst the historical books of this period, the texts borrowed from earlier sources have a linguistic colouring perceptibly different from those derived from later sources, or passages which belong to the latest redactor himself. Yet the structure of the language, and, apart from isolated cases, even the vocabulary and phraseology, are on the whole the same, especially in the prose books.

But the *poetic language* is in many ways distinguished from ^q prose, not only by a *rhythm* due to more strictly balanced (parallel) members and definite metres (see r), but also by peculiar *words* and *meanings*, *inflexions* and *syntactical constructions* which it uses in addition to those usual in prose. This distinction, however, does not go far as, for example, in Greek. Many of these poetic peculiarities occur in the kindred languages, especially in Aramaic, as the ordinary modes of expression, and probably are to be regarded largely as archaisms which poetry retained. Some perhaps, also, are

embellishments which the Hebrew poets who knew Aramaic adopted into their language.¹

The prophets, at least the earlier, in language and rhythm are to be regarded almost entirely as poets, except that with them the sentences are often more extended, and the parallelism is less regular and balanced than is the case with the poets properly so called. The language of the later prophets, on the contrary, approaches nearer to prose.

* On the *rhythm* of Hebrew poetry, see besides the Commentaries on the poetical books and Introductions to the O. T., J. Ley, *Grundzüge des Rhythmus*, &c., Halle, 1875; *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebr. Poesie*, Halle, 1887; 'Die metr. Beschaffenheit des B. Hiob,' in *Theol. Stud. u. Krik.*, 1895, iv, 1897, i; Grimme, 'Abriss der bibl.-hebr. Metrik,' *ZDMG.* 1896, p. 529 ff., 1897, p. 683 ff.; *Psalmprobleme*, &c., Freiburg (Switzerland), 1902 (on which see Beer in *ThLZ.* 1903, no. 11); 'Gedanken über hebr. Metrik,' in *Altschüler's Vierteljahrsschrift*, i (1903), 1 ff.; Döllner, *Rhythmus, Metrik u. Strophik in d. bibl.-hebr. Poesie*, Paderborn, 1899; Schloegl, *De re metrica veterum Hebraeorum disputatio*, Vindobonae, 1899 (on the same lines as Grimme); but especially Ed. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*: i *Studien zur hebr. Metrik*, pt. 1 *Untersuchungen*, pt. 2 *Textproben*, Lpz. 1901: ii *Die hebr. Genesis*, 1 *Texte*, 2 *Zur Quellenscheidung u. Textkritik*, Lpz. 1904 f.: iii *Samuel*, Lpz. 1907; *Amos metrisch bearbeitet* (with H. Guthe), Lpz. 1907; and his *Alttest. Miscellen* (1 *Is 24-27*, 2 *Jona*, 3 *Deutero-Zechariah*, 4 *Malachi*, 5 *Hosea*, 6 *Joel*, 7 *Obadiah*, 8 *Zephaniah*, 9 *Haggai*, 10 *Micah*), Lpz. 1904-7.—As a guide to Sievers' system (with some criticism of his principles) see Baumann, 'Die Metrik u. das A. T.,' in the *Theol. Rundschau*, viii (1905), 41 ff.; W. H. Cobb, *A criticism of systems of Hebrew Metre*, Oxford, 1905; Cornill, *Einleitung ins A. T.*³, Tübingen, 1905, p. 11 ff.; Rothstein, *Zeitschr. für d. ev. Rel.-Unterricht*, 1907, p. 188 ff. and his *Grundzüge des hebr. Rhythmus*, Lpz. 1909 (also separately *Psalmtexte u. der Text des Hohen Liedes*, Lpz. 1909); W. R. Arnold, 'The rhythms of the ancient Heb.,' in *O. T. and Semitic Studies in memory of W. R. Harper*, i. 165 ff., Chicago, 1907, according to whom the number of syllables between the beats is only limited by the physiological possibilities of phonetics; C. v. Orelli, 'Zur Metrik der alttest. Prophetenschriften,' in his *Kommentar zu den kl. Propheten*³, p. 236 ff., Munich, 1908.—In full agreement with Sievers is Baethgen, *Psalmen*³, p. xxvi ff., Göttingen, 1904. [Cf. Budde in *DB.* iv. 3 ff.; Duhm in *EB.* iii. 3793 ff.]

Of all views of this matter, the only one generally accepted as sound was at first Ley's and Budde's discovery of the Qina- or Lamentation-Verse (*ZA W.* 1882, 5 ff.; 1891, 234 ff.; 1892, 31 ff.). On their predecessors, Lowth, de Wette, Ewald, see Löhr, *Klagelied*², p. 9. This verse, called by Duhm 'long verse', by Sievers simply 'five-syllabled' (Fünfer), consists of two members, the second at least one beat shorter than the other. That a regular repetition of an equal number of syllables in *arsis* and *thesis* was observed by other poets, had been established by Ley, Duhm, Gunkel, Grimme, and others, especially Zimmern, who cites a Babylonian hymn in which the members are actually marked (*ZA.* x. 1 ff., xii. 382 ff.; cf. also Delitzsch, *Das babyl. Welterschöpfungsepos*, Lpz. 1896, pp. 60 ff.). Recently, however, E. Sievers, the recognized authority on metre in other branches of literature, has indicated, in the works mentioned above, a number of fresh facts and views, which have frequently been confirmed by the conclusions of Ley and others. The most important are as follows:—

Hebrew poetry, as distinguished from the quantitative Classical and Arabic

¹ That already in Isaiah's time (second half of the eighth century B. C.) educated Hebrews, or at least officers of state, understood Aramaic, while the common people in Jerusalem did not, is evident from 2 K 18²⁶ (Is 36¹¹).

and the syllabic Syriac verse, is *accentual*. The number of unstressed syllables between the beats (*ictus*) is, however, not arbitrary, but the scheme of the verse is based on an irregular anapaest which may undergo rhythmical modifications (e. g. resolving the ictus into two syllables, or lengthening the arsis so as to give a double accent) and contraction, e. g. of the first two syllables. The foot always concludes with the ictus, so that toneless endings, due to change of pronunciation or corruption of the text, are to be disregarded, although as a rule the ictus coincides with the Hebrew word-accent. The metrical scheme consists of combinations of feet in *series* (of 2, 3 or 4), and of these again in *periods*—double threes, very frequently, double fours in narrative, fives in Lamentations (see above) and very often elsewhere, and sevens. Sievers regards the last two metres as catalectic double threes and fours. Connected sections do not always maintain the same metre throughout, but often exhibit a mixture of metres.

It can no longer be doubted that in the analysis of purely poetical passages, this system often finds ready confirmation and leads to textual and literary results, such as the elimination of glosses. There are, however, various difficulties in carrying out the scheme consistently and extending it to the prophetic writings and still more to narrative: (1) not infrequently the required number of feet is only obtained by sacrificing the clearly marked parallelism, or the grammatical connexion (e. g. of the construct state with its genitive), and sometimes even by means of doubtful emendations; (2) the whole system assumes a correct transmission of the text and its pronunciation, for neither of which is there the least guarantee. To sum up, our conclusion at present is that for poetry proper some assured and final results have been already obtained, and others may be expected, from the principles laid down by Sievers, although, considering the way in which the text has been transmitted, a *faultless* arrangement of metres cannot be expected. Convincing proof of the *consistent* use of the same metrical schemes in the prophets, and *a fortiori* in narrative, can hardly be brought forward.

The great work of D. H. Müller, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprüngl. Form* (2 vols., Vienna, 1896; cf. his *Strophenbau u. Responion*, *ibid.* 1898, and *Komposition u. Strophenbau*, *ibid.* 1907), is a study of the most important monuments of early Semitic poetry from the point of view of strophic structure and the use of the refrain, i. e. the repetition of the same or similar phrases or words in corresponding positions in different strophes.

The arrangement of certain poetical passages in verse-form required by early scribal rules (Ex 15¹⁻¹⁹; Dt 32¹⁻⁴³; Ju 5; 1 S 2¹⁻¹⁰; 2 S 22, 23¹⁻⁷; ψ 18, 136; Pr. 31¹⁰⁻³¹; 1 Ch 168⁸⁻³⁶; cf. also Jo 12⁹⁻²⁴; Ec 3²⁻⁸; Est 9⁷⁻¹⁰) has nothing to do with the question of metre in the above sense.

Words are used in poetry, for which others are customary in prose, e. g. אָנָשׁ *man* = אָדָם ; $\text{אָרֶחַ$ *path* = דֶּרֶךְ ; מָלֶה *word* = דָּבָר ; הָזֶה *to see* = רָאָה ; אָתָה *to come* = בֹּא .

To the poetic meanings of words belongs the use of certain poetic *epithets* as substantives; thus, for example, אֱבִיר (only in constr. st. אֱבִירִי) *the strong one for God*; אֱבִיר *the strong one for bull, horse*; לְבָנָה *alba for luna*; צֵר *enemy for אֵיב*.

Of word-forms, we may note, e. g. the longer forms of prepositions of place (§ 103 n) עַל־ = עָלַי , אֶל־ = אֵלַי , עַד־ = עָדַי ; the endings ־י , ־י in the noun (§ 90); the pronominal suffixes מוֹי , מוֹי־ , מוֹי־ for מֶה , מֶה־ , מֶה־ (§ 58); the plural ending ־י for ־ים (§ 87 e). To the *syntax* belongs the far more sparing use of the article, of the relative pronoun, of the accusative particle אֵת ; the construct state even before prepositions; the shortened imperfect with the same meaning as the ordinary form (§ 109 i); the wider governing power of prepositions; and in general a forcible brevity of expression.

t 7. The *second* period of the Hebrew language and literature, after the return from the exile until the Maccabees (about 160 B.C.), is chiefly distinguished by a constantly closer approximation of the language to the kindred western Aramaic dialect. This is due to the influence of the Aramaeans, who lived in close contact with the recent and thinly-populated colony in Jerusalem, and whose dialect was already of importance as being the official language of the western half of the Persian empire. Nevertheless the supplanting of Hebrew by Aramaic proceeded only very gradually. Writings intended for popular use, such as the Hebrew original of Jesus the son of Sirach and the book of Daniel, not only show that Hebrew about 170 B.C. was still in use as a literary language, but also that it was still at least understood by the people.¹ When it had finally ceased to exist as a living language, it was still preserved as the *language of the Schools*—not to mention the numerous Hebraisms introduced into the Aramaic spoken by the Jews.

For particulars, see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, pp. 1-6. We may conveniently regard the relation of the languages which co-existed in this later period as similar to that of the High and Low German in North Germany, or to that of the High German and the common dialects in the south and in Switzerland. Even amongst the more educated, the common dialect prevails orally, whilst the High German serves essentially as the literary and cultured language, and is at least understood by all classes of the people. Wholly untenable is the notion, based on an erroneous interpretation of Neh 8⁸, that the Jews immediately after the exile had completely forgotten the Hebrew language, and therefore needed a translation of the Holy Scriptures.

u The Old Testament writings belonging to this second period, in all of which the Aramaic colouring appears in various degrees, are: certain parts of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, Ruth, the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther; the prophetic books of Haggai, Zechariah, Isaiah III (56-66), Malachi, Joel, Jonah, Daniel; of the poetical books, a large part of Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and most of the Psalms. As literary compositions, these books are sometimes far inferior to those of the first period, although work was still produced which in purity of language and aesthetic value falls little short of the writings of the golden age.

v Later words (Aramaisms) are, e.g. אָחָזָה declaration, אָנִים compel, בֶּר son, צִיר chalk, זָמֵן = עֵת time, רָאָה raise up, חִסֵּד Pi. reproach, טָלַל Pi. roof over,

¹ The extensive use of Hebrew in the popular religious literature which is partly preserved to us in the Midrašim, the Mišna, and the Liturgy, indicates, moreover, that Hebrew was widely understood much later than this. Cf. M. H. Segal, 'Mišnaic Hebrew and its relations to Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic,' in *J. Q. R.*, 1908, p. 647 ff. (also separately).

מָעַר stray, רֶכֶּם rock, מִלֵּךְ advise, סוֹף = קֵץ end, לָקַח = קָח take, רָצַץ = רָצַע break, שָׂנְא be many, מִלְּךְ = שֶׁלְּךָ rule, אָמַץ = תָּקַף be strong.—Later meanings are, e.g. אָמַר (to say) to command; עָנָה (to answer) to begin speaking.—Orthographical and grammatical peculiarities are, the frequent *scriptio plena* of י and ו, e.g. דְּוִיָּד¹ (elsewhere דָּוִד), even קוֹדֶשׁ for קֹדֶשׁ, רֹב for רַב; the interchange of ה and ח final; the more frequent use of substantives in ון, וַ, וְ, &c. Cf. Dav. Strauss, *Sprachl. Studien zu d. hebr. Sprachfragmenten*, Zürich, 1900, p. 19 ff.; for the Psalms Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 461 ff., and especially Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 276 ff.; in general, Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im A. T.* (i, Lexikal. Teil), Halle, 1902.

But all the peculiarities of these later writers are not Aramaisms. Several do not occur in Aramaic and must have belonged at an earlier period to the Hebrew vernacular, especially it would seem in northern Palestine. There certain parts of Judges, amongst others, may have originated, as is indicated, e.g. by שָׁ, a common form in Phoenician (as well as שֶׁן), for אֶשֶׁר (§ 36), which afterwards recurs in Jonah, Lamentations, the Song of Songs, the later Psalms, and Ecclesiastes.

Rem. 1. Of dialectal varieties in the old Hebrew language, only one ⁷⁰ express mention occurs in the O. T. (Ju 12⁶), according to which the Ephraimites in certain cases pronounced the ש as ס. (Cf. Marquart in *ZAW.* 1888, p. 151 ff.) Whether in Neh 13²⁴ by the speech of Ashdod a Hebrew, or a (wholly different) Philistine dialect is intended, cannot be determined. On the other hand, many peculiarities in the North Palestinian books (Judges and Hosea) are probably to be regarded as differences in dialect, and so also some anomalies in the Moabite inscription of Mēša' (see above, d). On later developments see L. Metman, *Die hebr. Sprache, ihre Geschichte u. lexikal. Entwicklung seit Abschluss des Kanons u. ihr Bau in d. Gegenwart*, Jerusalem, 1906.

2. It is evident that, in the extant remains of old Hebrew literature,² the entire store of the ancient language is not preserved. The canonical books of the Old Testament formed certainly only a fraction of the whole Hebrew national literature.

§ 3. Grammatical Treatment of the Hebrew Language.

Gesenius, *Gesch. der hebr. Sprache*, §§ 19–39; Oehler's article, 'Hebr. Sprache,' in Schmid's *Encykl. des ges. Erziehungs- u. Unterrichtswesens*, vol. iii. p. 346 ff. (in the 2nd ed. revised by Nestle, p. 314 ff.). Cf. also the literature cited above in the headings of §§ 1 and 2; also Böttcher, *Lehrb. der hebr. Spr.*, i. Lpz. 1866, p. 30 ff.; L. Geiger, *Das Studium der Hebr. Spr. in Deutschl. vom Ende des XV. bis zur Mitte des XVI. Jahrh.*, Breslau, 1870; B. Pick, 'The Study of the Hebrew Language among Jews and Christians,' in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1884, p. 450 ff., and 1885, p. 470 ff.; W. Bacher, article 'Grammar' in the *Jew. Encyclopaedia*, vol. vi, New York and London, 1904. Cf. also the note on d.

1. At the time when the old Hebrew language was gradually *a* becoming extinct, and the formation of the O. T. canon was

¹ דְּוִיָּד in the Minor Prophets throughout (Ho 3⁵, &c.) is due merely to a caprice of the Masoretes.

² According to the calculation of the Dutch scholar Leusden, the O. T. contains 5,642 different Hebrew and Aramaic words; according to rabbinical calculations, 79,856 altogether in the Pentateuch. Cf. also E. Nestle, *ZAW.* 1906, p. 283; H. Strack, *ZAW.* 1907, p. 69 ff.; Blau, 'Neue masoret. Studien,' in *JQR.* xvi. 357 ff., treats of the number of letters and words, and the verse-division in the O. T.

approaching completion, the Jews began to explain and critically revise their sacred text, and sometimes to translate it into the vernacular languages which in various countries had become current among them. The oldest *translation* is the Greek of the *Seventy* (more correctly *Seventy-two*) Interpreters (LXX), which was begun with the Pentateuch at Alexandria under Ptolemy Philadelphus, but only completed later. It was the work of various authors, some of whom had a living knowledge of the original, and was intended for the use of Greek-speaking Jews, especially in Alexandria. Somewhat later the Aramaic translations, or Targums (תרגומים i.e. *interpretations*), were formed by successive recensions made in Palestine and Babylonia. The *explanations*, derived in part from alleged tradition, refer almost exclusively to civil and ritual law and dogmatic theology, and are no more scientific in character than much of the textual tradition of that period. Both kinds of tradition are preserved in the *Talmud*, the first part of which, the *Mišna*, was finally brought to its present form towards the end of the second century; of the remainder, the *Gemāra*, one recension (the *Jerusalem* or *Palestinian Gem.*) about the middle of the fourth century, the other (the *Babylonian Gem.*) about the middle of the sixth century A.D. The *Mišna* forms the beginning of the New-Hebrew literature; the language of the *Gemaras* is for the most part Aramaic.

b 2. To the interval between the completion of the *Talmud* and the earliest grammatical writers, belong mainly the vocalization and accentuation of the hitherto unpointed text of the O. T., according to the pronunciation traditional in the Synagogues and Schools (§ 7 h, i), as well as the greater part of the collection of critical notes which bears the name of Masōra (מסורה *traditio*?).¹ From this the text which has since been transmitted with rigid uniformity by the MSS.,

¹ On the name Masora (or Massora, as e.g. E. König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 38 ff.; *Lehrgeb. d. hebr. Sprache*, ii. 358 ff.), and the great difficulty of satisfactorily explaining it, cf. De Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, i. 91 ff. W. Bacher's derivation of the expression (in *JQR.* 1891, p. 785 ff.; so also C. Levias in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Cincinnati, 1904, p. 147 ff.) from Ez 20³⁷ (מסרת הברית; מסרה, i.e. מוסרה, being an equally legitimate form) is rightly rejected by König, l. c. The correctness of the form מסרה (by the side of the equally well-attested form מסרת) does not seem to us to be invalidated by his arguments, nor by Blau's proposal to read מסורת (*JQR.* xii. 241). The remark of Levias (l.c.) deserves notice, that with the earlier Masoretes מסורת is equivalent to orthography, i. e. *plene-* and *defective* writing, and only later came to mean *traditio*.—G. Wildboer, in *ZAW.* 1909, p. 74, contends that as מסר to *hand on* is not found in the O. T., it must be a late denominative in this sense.

and is still the received text of the O. T., has obtained the name of the Masoretic Text.

E. F. K. Rosenmüller already (*Handbuch für d. Liter. der bibl. Kritik u. C. Exegese*, 1797, i. 247; *Vorrede zur Stereotyp-Ausg. des A. T.*, Lpz. 1834) maintained that our O. T. text was derived from Codices belonging to a single recension. J. G. Sommer (cf. Cornill, *ZAW.* 1892, p. 309), Olshausen (since 1853), and especially De Lagarde (*Proverbes*, 1863, p. 1 ff.), have even made it probable that the original Masoretic text was derived from a single standard manuscript. Cf., however, E. König in *Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss.*, 1887, p. 279 ff., and especially his *Einleitung ins A. T.*, p. 88 ff. Moreover a great many facts, which will be noticed in their proper places, indicate that the Masora itself is by no means uniform but shows clear traces of different schools and opinions; cf. H. Strack in *Semitic Studies in memory of . . . Kohut*, Berlin, 1897, p. 563 ff. An excellent foundation for the history of the Masora and the settlement of the masoretic tradition was laid by Joh. Buxtorf in his *Tiberias seu Commentarius Masorethicus*, first published at Basel in 1620 as an appendix to the Rabbinical Bible of 1618 f. For more recent work see Geiger, *Jüdische Ztschr.*, iii. 78 ff., followed by Harris in *JQR.* i. 128 ff., 243 ff.; S. Frensdorff, *Ochla W'ochla*, Hanover, 1864; and his *Massor. Wörterb.*, part i, Hanover and Lpz. 1876; and Ch. D. Ginsburg, *The Massora compiled from Manuscripts, &c.*, 3 vols., Lond. 1880 ff., and *Introduction to the Massoretico-critical edition of the Hebr. Bible*, Lond. 1897 (his text, reprinted from that of Jacob b. Hayyim [Venice, 1524-5] with variants from MSS. and the earliest editions, was published in 2 vols. at London in 1894, 2nd ed. 1906; a revised edition is in progress); H. Hyvernat, 'La langue et le langage de la Massore' (as a mixture of New-Hebrew and Aramaic), in the *Revue biblique*, Oct. 1903, p. 529 ff. and B: 'Lexique massorétique,' *ibid.*, Oct. 1904, p. 521 ff., 1905, p. 481 ff., and p. 515 ff. In the use of the Massora for the critical construction of the Text, useful work has been done especially by S. Baer, in the editions of the several books (only Exod.-Deut. have still to appear), edited from 1869 conjointly with Fr. Delitzsch, and since 1891 by Baer alone. Cf. also § 7 h.

The various readings of the Q'rê (see § 17) form one of the oldest and most important parts of the Masora. The punctuation of the Text, however, is not to be confounded with the compilation of the Masora. The former was settled at an earlier period, and is the result of a much more exhaustive labour than the Masora, which was not completed till a considerably later time.

3. It was not until about the beginning of the tenth century that *d* the Jews, following the example of the Arabs, began their grammatical compilations. Of the numerous grammatical and lexicographical works of R. Sa'adya,¹ beyond fragments in the commentary on the Sepher Yešira (ed. Mayer-Lambert, pp. 42, 47, 75, &c.), only the explanation in Arabic of the seventy (more correctly ninety) *hapax legomena* in the O. T. has been preserved. Written likewise in Arabic, but frequently translated into Hebrew, were the still extant works of the grammarians R. Yehuda Hayyûg (also called Abu Zakarya Yahya, about the year 1000) and R. Yona (Abu 'l-Walid Merwân ibn Ġanâh, about 1030). By the aid of these earlier labours, Abraham ben Ezra (commonly called Aben Ezra, ob. 1167) and R. David Qimhi (ob. c. 1235) especially gained a classical reputation by their Hebrew grammatical writings.

¹ On his independent attitude towards the Masoretic punctuation, see Delitzsch, *Comm. zu den Psalmen*⁴, p. 39.

From these earliest grammarians are derived many principles of arrangement and technical terms, some of which are still retained, e. g. the naming of the conjugations and weak verbs according to the paradigm of פִּעַל, certain *voces memoriales*, as בִּי־רָפַחַת and the like.¹

e 4. The father of Hebrew philology among Christians was John Reuchlin (ob. 1522),² to whom Greek literature also is so much indebted. Like the grammarians who succeeded him, till the time of John Buxtorf the elder (ob. 1629), he still adhered almost entirely to Jewish tradition. From the middle of the seventeenth century the field of investigation gradually widened, and the study of the kindred languages, chiefly through the leaders of the Dutch school, Albert Schultens (ob. 1750) and N. W. Schröder (ob. 1798), became of fruitful service to Hebrew grammar.

f 5. In the nineteenth century³ the advances in Hebrew philology are especially connected with the names of W. Gesenius (born at Nordhausen, Feb. 3, 1786; from the year 1810 Professor at Halle, where he died Oct. 23, 1842), who above all things aimed at the comprehensive observation and lucid presentation of the actually occurring linguistic phenomena; H. Ewald (ob. 1875, at Göttingen; *Krit. Gramm. der Hebr. Spr.*, Lpz. 1827; *Ausführl. Lehrb. d. hebr. Spr.*, 8th ed., Gött. 1870), who chiefly aimed at referring linguistic forms to general laws and rationally explaining the latter; J. Olshausen (ob. 1882, at Berlin; *Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache*, Brunswick, 1861) who attempted a consistent explanation of the existing condition of the language, from the presupposed primitive Semitic forms, preserved according to him notably in old Arabic. F. Böttcher (*Ausführl. Lehrb. d. hebr. Spr.* ed. by F. Mühlau, 2 vols., Lpz. 1866-8) endeavoured to present an exhaustive synopsis of the linguistic phenomena, as well as to give an explanation of them from the sphere of Hebrew

¹ On the oldest Hebrew grammarians, see Strack and Siegfried, *Lehrb. d. neuhebr. Spr. u. Liter.*, Carlsr. 1884, p. 107 ff., and the prefaces to the Hebrew Lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst; Berliner. *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm. im Talmud u. Midrasch*, Berlin, 1879; Baer and Strack, *Die Dikduke ha-t'amim des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher u. andere alte grammatisch-massorethische Lehrstücke*, Lpz. 1879, and P. Kahle's criticisms in *ZDMG*. lv. 170, n. 2; Ewald and Dukes, *Beiträge z. Gesch. der ältesten Auslegung u. Spracherklärung des A. T.*, Stuttg. 1844, 3 vols.; Hupfeld, *De rei grammaticae apud Judaeos initiis antiquissimisque scriptoribus*, Hal. 1846; W. Bacher, 'Die Anfänge der hebr. Gr.', in *ZDMG*. 1895, 1 ff. and 335 ff.; and *Die hebr. Sprachwissenschaft vom 10. bis zum 16. Jahrh.*, Trier, 1892.

² A strong impulse was naturally given to these studies by the introduction of printing—the Psalter in 1477, the Bologna Pentateuch in 1482, the Soncino O. T. complete in 1488: see the description of the twenty-four earliest editions (down to 1528) in Ginsburg's *Introduction*, p. 779 ff.

³ Of the literature of the subject down to the year 1850, see a tolerably full account in Steinschneider's *Bibliogr. Handb. f. hebr. Sprachkunde*, Lpz. 1859.

alone. B. Stade, on the other hand (*Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, pt. i. Lpz. 1879), adopted a strictly scientific method in endeavouring to reduce the systems of Ewald and Olshausen to a more fundamental unity. E. König¹ in his very thorough researches into the phonology and accidence starts generally from the position reached by the early Jewish grammarians (in his second part 'with comparative reference to the Semitic languages in general') and instead of adopting the usual dogmatic method, takes pains to re-open the discussion of disputed grammatical questions. The syntax König has 'endeavoured to treat in several respects in such a way as to show its affinity to the common Semitic syntax'.—Among the works of Jewish scholars, special attention may be called to the grammar by S. D. Luzzatto written in Italian (Padua, 1853-69).

The chief requirements for one who is treating the grammar of an ancient language are—(1) that he should *observe* as fully and accurately as possible the existing linguistic phenomena and *describe* them, after showing their organic connexion (the empirical and historico-critical element); (2) that he should try to *explain* these facts, partly by comparing them with one another and by the analogy of the sister languages, partly from the general laws of philology (the logical element).

Such observation has more and more led to the belief that the original text of the O. T. has suffered to a much greater extent than former scholars were inclined to admit, in spite of the number of variants in parallel passages: Is 2^{2^{ff.}}=Mi 4^{1^{ff.}}, Is 36-39=2 K 18^{13-20¹⁹}, Jer 52=2 K 24^{18-25³⁰}, 2 S 22=ψ 18, ψ 14=ψ 53, ψ 40^{14^{ff.}}=ψ 70, ψ 108=ψ 57^{8^{ff.}} and 60^{7^{ff.}}. Cf. also the parallels between the Chronicles and the older historical books, and F. Vodel, *Die konsonant. Varianten in den doppelt überlief. poet. Stücken d. masoret. Textes*, Lpz. 1905. As to the extent and causes of the corruption of the Masoretic text, the newly discovered fragments of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus are very instructive; cf. Smend, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1906, p. 763.

The causes of *unintentional* corruption in the great majority of cases are:—Interchange of similar letters, which has sometimes taken place in the early 'Phoenician' writing; transposition or omission of

¹ *Historisch-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Sprache mit steter Beziehung auf Qimchi und die anderen Autoritäten*: I, 'Lehre von der Schrift, der Aussprache, dem Pron. u. dem Verbum,' Lpz. 1881; II. 1, 'Abschluss der speziellen Formenlehre u. generelle Formenl.,' 1895; ii. 2, 'Historisch-kompar. Syntax d. hebr. Spr.,' 1897.

single letters, words, or even whole sentences, which are then often added in the margin and thence brought back into the text in the wrong place; such omission is generally due to homoioteleuton (cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 171 ff.), i. e. the scribe's eye wanders from the place to a subsequent word of the same or similar form. Other causes are dittography, i. e. erroneous repetition of letters, words, and even sentences; its opposite, haplography; and lastly wrong division of words (cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 158 ff.), since at a certain period in the transmission of the text the words were not separated.¹—*Intentional* changes are due to corrections for the sake of decency or of dogma, and to the insertion of glosses, some of them very early.

Advance in grammar is therefore closely dependent on progress in *textual criticism*. The systematic pursuit of the latter has only begun in recent years: cf. especially Doorninck on Ju 1-16, Leid. 1879; Wellhausen, *Text der Bb. Sam.*, Gött. 1871; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, Lpz. 1886; Klostermann, *Bb. Sam. u. d. Kön.*, Nördl. 1887; Driver, *Notes on the Hebr. text of the Books of Sam.*, Oxf. 1890; Klostermann, *Deuterijosaja*, Munich, 1893; Oort, *Textus hebr. emendationes*, Lugd. 1900; Burney on *Kings*, Oxf. 1903; the commentaries of Marti and Nowack; the *Internat. Crit. Comm.*; Kautzsch, *Die heil. Schriften des A.T.*², 1909-10. A critical edition of the O.T. with full textual notes, and indicating the different documents by colours, is being published in a handsome form by P. Haupt in *The Sacred Books of the Old Test.*, Lpz. and Baltimore, 1893 ff. (sixteen parts have appeared: Exod., Deut., Minor Prophets, and Megilloth are still to come); Kittel, *Biblia hebraica*², 1909, Masoretic text from Jacob b. Ḥayyim (see c), with a valuable selection of variants from the versions, and emendations.

§ 4. Division and Arrangement of the Grammar.

The division and arrangement of Hebrew grammar follow the three constituent parts of every language, viz. (1) articulate *sounds* represented by *letters*, and united to form *syllables*, (2) *words*, and (3) *sentences*.

The first part (the elements) comprises accordingly the treatment of *sounds* and their representation in writing. It describes the nature and relations of the sounds of the language, teaches the pronunciation

¹ This *scriptio continua* is also found in Phœnician inscriptions. The inscription of Mē'a' always divides the words by a point (and so the Siloam inscription; see the facsimile at the beginning of this grammar), and frequently marks the close of a sentence by a stroke.

of the written signs (orthoepy), and the established mode of writing (orthography). It then treats of the sounds as combined in syllables and words, and specifies the laws and conditions under which this combination takes place.

The second part (etymology) treats of words in their character as parts of speech, and comprises: (1) the principles of the *formation of words*, or of the derivation of the different parts of speech from the roots or from one another; (2) the principles of *inflexion*, i. e. of the various forms which the words assume according to their relation to other words and to the sentence.

The third part (syntax, or the arrangement of words): (1) shows how the word-formations and inflexions occurring in the language are used to express different shades of ideas, and how other ideas, for which the language has not coined any forms, are expressed by periphrasis; (2) states the laws according to which the parts of speech are combined in sentences (the principles of the sentence, or syntax in the stricter sense of the term).

FIRST PART

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OR THE SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

CHAPTER I

THE INDIVIDUAL SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS

§ 5. *The Consonants: their Forms and Names.*

(Cf. the Table of Alphabets.)

Among the abundant literature on the subject, special attention is directed to : A. Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm.*, Berlin, 1879, p. 15 ff., on the names, forms, and pronunciation of the consonants in Talmud and Midrash; H. Strack, *Schreibkunst u. Schrift bei d. Hebräern*, PRE.³, Lpz. 1906, p. 766 ff.; Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäologie*², Tübingen, 1907, p. 172 ff.; Nowack, *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Archäol.*, Freiburg, 1894, i. 279 ff.; Lidzbarski, *Handbuch d. nordsem. Epigraphik*, Weimar, 1898, i. 173 ff.; also his art. 'Hebrew Alphabet,' in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, i, 1901, p. 439 ff. (cf. his *Ephemeris*, i. 316 ff.); and 'Die Namen der Alphabetbuchstaben', in *Ephemeris*, ii. 125 ff.; Kenyon, art. 'Writing,' in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv. Edinb. 1902, p. 944 ff.; Nöldeke, 'Die semit. Buchstabennamen,' in *Beitr. zur semit. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb. 1904, p. 124 ff.; F. Praetorius, *Ueber den Ursprung des kanaän. Alphabets*, Berlin, 1906; H. Grimme, 'Zur Genesis des semit. Alphabets,' in *ZA.* xx. 1907, p. 49 ff.; R. Stübe, *Grundlinien zu einer Entwicklungsgesch. d. Schrift*, Munich, 1907; Jermain, *In the path of the Alphabet*, Fort Wayne, 1907.—L. Blau, *Studien zum althebr. Buchwesen*, &c., Strassb. 1902; and his 'Ueber d. Einfluss d. althebr. Buchwesens auf d. Originale', &c., in *Festschr. zu Ehren A. Berliners*, Frkf. 1903.

The best tables of alphabets are those of J. Euting in G. Bickell's *Outlines of Heb. Gram.* transl. by S. I. Curtiss, Lpz. 1877; in Pt. vii of the *Oriental Series* of the Palaeographical Soc., London, 1882; and, the fullest of all, in Chwolson's *Corpus inscr. Hebr.*, Petersburg, 1882; also Lidzbarski's in the *Jewish Encycl.*, see above.

- a 1. The Hebrew letters now in use, in which both the manuscripts of the O. T. are written and our editions of the Bible are printed, commonly called the *square character* (פְּתִיב מִרְבָּע), also the *Assyrian character* (פְּ אֲשֻׁרִי),¹ are not those originally employed.

Old Hebrew (or *Old Canaanitish*²) writing, as it was used on

¹ The name אֲשֻׁרִי (Assyria) is here used in the widest sense, to include the countries on the Mediterranean inhabited by Aramaeans; cf. Stade in *ZAW.* 1882, p. 292 f. On some other names for Old Hebrew writing. cf. G. Hoffmann, *ibid.* 1881, p. 334 ff.; Buhl, *Canon and Text of the O. T.* (transl. by J. Macpherson), Edinb. 1892, p. 200.

² It is tacitly assumed here that this was the mother of all Semitic alphabets. In *ZDMG.* 1909, p. 189 ff., however, Prätorius has shown good

public monuments in the beginning of the ninth and in the second half of the eighth century B.C., is to be seen in the inscription of Mēša', as well as in that of Siloam. The characters on the Macca-baeen coins of the second century B.C., and also on ancient gems, still bear much resemblance to this (cf. § 2 d). With the Old Hebrew writing the Phoenician is nearly identical (see § 1 k, § 2 f, and the Table of Alphabets). From the analogy of the history of other kinds of writing, it may be assumed that out of and along with this monumental character, a less antique and in some ways more convenient, rounded style was early developed, for use on softer materials, skins, bark, papyrus, and the like. This the Samaritans retained after their separation from the Jews, while the Jews gradually¹ (between the sixth and the fourth century) exchanged it for an Aramaic character. From this gradually arose (from about the fourth to the middle of the third century) what is called the *square character*, which consequently bears great resemblance to the extant forms of Aramaic writing, such as the Egyptian-Aramaic, the Nabatean and especially the Palmyrene. Of Hebrew inscriptions in the older square character, that of 'Arâq al-Emîr (15½ miles north-east of the mouth of the Jordan) probably belongs to 183 B.C.²

The Jewish sarcophagus-inscriptions of the time of Christ, found in Jerusalem in 1905, almost without exception exhibit a pure square character. This altered little in the course of centuries, so that the age of a Hebrew MS. cannot easily be determined from the style of the writing. The oldest known biblical fragment is the Nash papyrus (found in 1902), containing the ten commandments and the beginning of Dt 6⁴¹, of the end of the first or beginning of the second century A. D.; cf. N. Peters, *Die älteste Abschr. der 10 Gebote*, Freibg. i. B. 1905. Of actual MSS. of the Bible the oldest is probably one of 820–850 A. D. described by Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 469 ff., at the head of his sixty principal MSS.; next in age is the codex of Moses ben Asher at Cairo (897 A. D., cf. the art. 'Scribes' in the *Jew. Encycl.* xi and Gottheil in *JQR.* 1905, p. 32). The date (916 A. D.) of the Codex prophetarum Babylon. Petropol. (see § 8 g, note) is quite certain.—In the synagogue-rolls a distinction is drawn between the Tam-character (said to be so called from Rabbi Tam, grandson of R. Yishāqī, in the twelfth century) with its straight strokes, square corners and 'tittles' (tāgin), in German and Polish MSS., and the *foreign* character with rounded letters and tittles in Spanish MSS. See further E. König, *Einl. in das A. T.*, Bonn, 1893, p. 16 ff.

grounds for believing that the South Semitic alphabet is derived not from the Mēša' character, or from some kindred and hardly older script, but from some unknown and *much* earlier form of writing.

¹ On the effect of the transitional mixture of earlier and later forms on the constitution of the text, see R. Kittel, *Ueber d. Notwendigk. d. Herausg. einer neuen hebr. Bibel*, Lpz. 1901, p. 20 ff.—L. Blau, 'Wie lange stand die althebr. Schrift bei den Juden im Gebrauch?' in *Kaufmannsgedenkbuch*, Breslau, 1900, p. 44 ff.

² Not 176, as formerly held. Driver and Lidzbarski now read ערביה, correctly, not טוּבִיָּה.

b 2. The Alphabet consists, like all Semitic alphabets, solely of consonants, twenty-two in number, some of which, however, have also a kind of vocalic power (§ 7 b). The following Table shows their form, names, pronunciation, and numerical value (see *k*):—

FORM.	NAME.	PRONUNCIATION.	NUMERICAL VALUE.
א	' <i>Ālēph</i>	' <i>spiritus lenis</i>	1
ב	<i>Bēth</i>	<i>b</i> (<i>bh</i> , but see § 6 n)	2
ג	<i>Gimēl</i> (<i>Giml</i>)	<i>g</i> (<i>gh</i> , " " ")	3
ד	<i>Dālēth</i>	<i>d</i> (<i>dh</i> , " " ")	4
ה	<i>Hē</i>	<i>h</i>	5
ו	<i>Wāw</i> (<i>Wāu</i>)	<i>w</i> (<i>u</i>) ¹	6
ז	<i>Zāyīn</i>	<i>z</i> , as in English (soft <i>s</i>)	7
ח	<i>Hēth</i>	<i>h</i> , a strong guttural	8
ט	<i>Ṭēth</i>	<i>t</i> , emphatic <i>t</i>	9
י	<i>Yôd</i>	<i>y</i> (<i>i</i>) ¹	10
כ, final ך	<i>Kaph</i>	<i>k</i> (<i>kh</i> , but see § 6 n)	20
ל	<i>Lāmēd</i>	<i>l</i>	30
מ, final ם	<i>Mēm</i>	<i>m</i>	40
נ, final ן	<i>Nūn</i>	<i>n</i>	50
ס	<i>Sāmēkh</i>	<i>s</i>	60
ע	' <i>Āyīn</i>	' a peculiar guttural (see below)	70
פ, final ף	<i>Pē</i>	<i>p</i> (<i>f</i> , see § 6 n)	80
צ, final ץ	<i>Ṣādē</i>	<i>s</i> , emphatic <i>s</i>	90
ק	<i>Qôf</i>	<i>q</i> , a strong <i>k</i> ² formed at the back of the palate	100
ר	<i>Rēš</i>	<i>r</i>	200
שׁ	<i>Śīn</i>	<i>ś</i>	} 300
שׂ	<i>Šīn</i> ³	<i>š</i> , pronounced <i>sh</i>	
ת	<i>Tāw</i> (<i>Tāu</i>)	<i>t</i> (<i>th</i> , but see § 6 n)	400

¹ Philippi, 'Die Aussprache der semit. Consonanten י und י,' in *ZDMG.* 1886, p. 639 ff., 1897, p. 66 ff., adduces reasons in detail for the opinion that 'the Semitic י and י' are certainly by usage consonants, although by nature they are vowels, viz. *u* and *i*, and consequently are consonantal vowels'; cf. § 8 m.

² As a representation of this sound the Latin *q* is very suitable, since it occupies in the alphabet the place of the Semitic ק (Greek κόππα).

³ Nestle (*Actes du onzième Congrès . . . des Orientalistes*, 1897, iv. 113 ff.) has shown that the original order was שׁ, שׂ.

3. As the Table shows, five letters have a special form at the end of the word. They are called final letters, and were combined by the Jewish grammarians in the mnemonic word *כַּמְנֶפְהָס* *Kamnèphäs*, or better, with A. Müller and Stade, *כַּמְנֶפֶץ* i. e. *as the breaker in pieces*.¹ Of these, *ך*, *ן*, *ף*, *ץ* are distinguished from the common form by the shaft being drawn straight down, while in the usual form it is bent round towards the left.² In the case of *ס* the letter is completely closed.

4. Hebrew is read and written from right to left.³ Words must *d* not be divided at the end of the lines; ⁴ but, in order that no empty space may be left, in MSS. and printed texts, certain letters suitable for the purpose are dilated at the end or in the middle of the line. In our printed texts these *literae dilatabiles* are the five following: *ס ת ל ה ז* (mnemonic word *סַחֲלֵתֶם* *'ahaltèm*). In MSS. other letters suitable for the purpose are also employed in this way, as *ך ב ר*; cf. Strack in the *Theol. Lehrb.*, 1882, No. 22; Nestle, *ZAW.* 1906, p. 170 f.

Rem. 1. The forms of the letters originally represent the rude outlines of *c* perceptible objects, the names of which, respectively, begin with the consonant represented (akrophony). Thus *Yôd*, in the earlier alphabets the rude picture of a hand, properly denotes *hand* (Heb. *יָד*), but as a letter simply the sound *'* (*y*), with which this word begins; *'Ayin*, originally a circle, properly an *eye* (*עֵינַי*), stands for the consonant *ʿ*. In the Phoenician alphabet, especially, the resemblance of the forms to the objects denoted by the name is still for the most part recognizable (see the Table). In some letters (*ג ו ז ט ש*) the similarity is still preserved in the square character.

It is another question whether the present names are all original. They may be merely due to a later, and not always accurate, interpretation of the forms. Moreover, it is possible that in the period from about 1500 to 1000 B. C. the original forms underwent considerable change.

The usual explanation of the present names of the letters⁵ is: *א ב ג ד ה ו ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת* *ox, f*

¹ In the Talmud, disregarding the alphabetical order, *כַּמְנֶפֶץ* of *thy watcher*, i. e. *prophet*. See the discussions of this mnemonic word by Nestle, *ZAW.* 1907, p. 119 ff., König, Bacher (who would read *כַּמְנֶפֶץ* = *proceeding from thy prophets*, Is 52⁸), Krauss, Marmorstein, *ibid.* p. 278 ff. All the twenty-two letters, together with the five final forms, occur in Zp 3⁸.

² Chwolson, *Corpus Inscr. Hebr.*, col. 68, rightly observes that the more original forms of these letters are preserved in the *literae finales*. Instances of them go back to the time of Christ.

³ The same was originally the practice in Greek, which only adopted the opposite direction exclusively about 400 B. C. On the *boustrophædon* writing (alternately in each direction) in early Greek, early Sabaeen, and in the Saba-inscriptions of the first three centuries A. D., cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 116 f.

⁴ This does not apply to early inscriptions or seals. Cf. Mēša', ll. 1-5, 7, 8, &c., Siloam 2, 3, 5, where the division of words appears to be customary.

⁵ We possess Greek transcriptions of the Hebrew names, dating from the fifth century B. C. The LXX give them (in almost the same form as Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* 10. 5) in La 1-4, as do also many Codices of the Vulgate (e. g. the

בֵּית *house*, נֶמֶל *camel* (according to Lidzbarski, see below, perhaps originally גֵּרֶן *axe* or *pick-axe*), דֶּלֶת *door* (properly *folding-door*; according to Lidzbarski, perhaps דָּר *the female breast*), חַיָּה *air-hole* (?), *lattice-window* (?), וָו *hook, nail*, יָוֵן *weapon* (according to Nestle, comparing the Greek ζῆτρα, rather יָוֵן *olive-tree*), חֵית *fence, barrier* (but perhaps only differentiated from ה by the left-hand stroke), מֵית *a winding* (?), according to others a *leather bottle* or a *snake* (but perhaps only differentiated from ת by a circle round it), יָד *hand*, בָּנָה *bent hand*, לֶמֶךְ *ox-goad*, מַיִם *water*, נֶשֶׁן *fish* (Lidzbarski, 'perhaps originally נָחֵשׁ *snake*,' as in Ethiopic), סֶמֶךָ *prop* (perhaps a modification of עֵץ, עֵינַי *eye*, פֶּה *mouth*, צֶדֶי *fish-hook* (?), עֵינַי *eye of a needle*, according to others *back of the head* (Lidzb., 'perhaps קֶשֶׁת *bow*'), רִישׁ *head*, שֵׁן *tooth*, סֶמֶךָ *sign, cross*.

g With regard to the origin of this alphabet, it may be taken as proved that it is not earlier (or very little earlier) than the fifteenth century B. C., since otherwise the el-Amarna tablets (§ 2 f) would not have been written exclusively in cuneiform.¹ It seems equally certain on various grounds, that it originated on Canaanitish soil. It is, however, still an open question whether the inventors of it borrowed

(a) From the Egyptian system—not, as was formerly supposed, by direct adoption of hieroglyphic signs (an explanation of twelve or thirteen characters was revived by J. Halévy in *Rev. Sémit.* 1901, p. 356 ff., 1902, p. 331 ff., and in the *Verhandlungen des xiii. . . Orient.-Kongr. zu Hamb.*, Leiden, 1904, p. 199 ff.; but cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 261 ff.), or of hieratic characters derived from them (so E. de Rougé), but by the adoption of the *acrophonic* principle (see e) by which e. g. the hand, in Egyptian *tot*, represents the letter *t*, the lion = *laboi*, the letter *l*. This view still seems the most probable. It is now accepted by Lidzbarski ('Der Ursprung d. nord- u. südsemit. Schrift' in *Ephemeris*, i (1900), 109 ff., cf. pp. 134 and 261 ff.), though in his *Nordsem. Epigr.* (1898) p. 173 ff. he was still undecided.

(b) From the Babylonian (cuneiform) system. Wuttke's and W. Deecke's derivation of the old-Semitic alphabet from new-Assyrian cuneiform is impossible for chronological reasons. More recently Peters and Hommel have sought to derive it from the old-Babylonian, and Ball from the archaic Assyrian cuneiform. A vigorous discussion has been aroused by the theory of Frdr. Delitzsch (in *Die Entstehung des ält. Schriftsystems od. der Urspr. der Keilschriftzeichen dargel.*, Lpz. 1897; and with the same title 'Ein Nachwort', Lpz. 1898, preceded by a very clear outline of the theory) that the old-Semitic alphabet arose in Canaan under the influence both of the Egyptian system (whence the *acrophonic* principle) and of the old-Babylonian, whence the principle of the graphic representation of objects and ideas by means of simple, and mostly rectilinear, signs. He holds that the choice of the objects was probably (in about fifteen cases) influenced by the Babylonian system. The correspondence of names had all the more effect since, according to Zimmern (*ZDMG.* 1896, p. 667 ff.), out of twelve names which are certainly identical, eight appear in the same order in the Babylonian arrangement of signs. But it must first be shown that the present names of the

Cod. Amiatinus) in ψψ 111, 112, 119, but with many variations from the customary forms, which rest on the traditional Jewish pronunciation. The forms *Deleth* (and *delth*), *Zai*, *Sen* (LXX also χεν, cf. Hebr. שֵׁן *tooth*) are to be noticed, amongst others, for *Daleth*, *Zain*, *Šin*. Cf. the tables in Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 126 f. In his opinion (and so Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 134) the form and meaning of the names point to Phœnicia as the original home of the alphabet, since *alf*, *bēt*, *dalt*, *wāw*, *tāw*, *pei* = *pē*, *pi*, *mouth*, and the vowel of *ṣw* = *rōš*, *head*, are all Hebraeo-Phœnician.

¹ In the excavations at Jericho in April, 1907, E. Sellin found a jar-handle with the Canaanite characters יָה, which he dates (probably too early) about 1500 B. C.

'Phoenician' letters really denote the original picture. The identity of the objects may perhaps be due simply to the choice of the commonest things (animals, implements, limbs) in both systems.

The derivation of the Semitic alphabet from the signs of the Zodiac and their names, first attempted by Seyffarth in 1834, has been revived by Winckler, who refers twelve fundamental sounds to the Babylonian Zodiac. Hommel connects the original alphabet with the moon and its phases, and certain constellations; cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 269 ff., and in complete agreement with him, Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäologie*², p. 173 ff. This theory is by no means convincing.

(c) From the hieroglyphic system of writing discovered in 1894 by A. J. Evans in inscriptions in Crete (esp. at Cnossus) and elsewhere. According to Kluge (1897) and others, this represents the 'Mycenaean script' used about 3000-1000 B. C., and according to Fries ('Die neuesten Forschungen über d. Urspr. des phöniz. Alph.' in *ZDPV*. xxii. 118 ff.) really supplies the original forms of the Phoenician alphabet as brought to Palestine by the Philistines about 1100 B. C., but 'the Phoenician-Canaanite-Hebrews gave to the Mycenaean signs names derived from the earlier cuneiform signs'. The hypothesis of Fries is thus connected with that of Delitzsch. But although the derivation of the Phoenician forms from 'Mycenaean' types appears in some cases very plausible, in others there are grave difficulties, and moreover the date, 1100 B. C., assigned for the introduction of the alphabet is clearly too late. [See Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, Oxf. 1909, p. 80 ff.]

(d) From a system, derived from Asia Minor, closely related to the Cypriote syllabary (Praetorius, *Der Urspr. des kanaan. Alphabets*, Berlin, 1906). On this theory the Canaanites transformed the syllabic into an apparently alphabetic writing. In reality, however, they merely retained a single sign for the various syllables, so that e.g. φ is not really *q*, but *qa*, *qe*, *qi*, &c. Of the five Cypriote vowels also they retained only the star (in Cypriote = *a*) simplified into an 'ālef' (see alphabetical table) to express the vowels at the beginning of syllables, and *i* and *u* as Yod and Waw. Praetorius claims to explain about half the twenty-two Canaanite letters in this way, but there are various objections to his ingenious hypothesis.

2. As to the order of the letters, we possess early evidence in the alphabetic¹ *h* poems: ψ 9 (N- β , cf. ψ 10¹ β , and vv¹²⁻¹⁷ ρ - η ; cf. Gray in the *Expositor*, 1906, p. 233 ff., and Rosenthal, *ZAW*. 1896, p. 40, who shows that ψ 9^{3.15-17} β , β , γ exactly fit in between η , η , γ , and that ψ 10^{1.3.5} therefore has the reverse order β , β , γ); also ψ 25 and 34 (both without a separate γ -verse and with β repeated at the end²); 37, 111, 112, 119 (in which every eight verses begin with the same letter, each strophe, as discovered by D. H. Müller of Vienna, containing the eight leading words of ψ 19⁸ ff., *tôrā*, *'edûth*, &c.); La 1-4 (in 2-4 β before γ ³, in chap. 3 every three verses with the same initial, see Löhr, *ZAW*. 1904, p. 1 ff., in chap. 5 at any rate as many verses as letters in the alphabet); Pr 24^{1.3.5}, 31¹⁰⁻³¹ (in the LXX with β before γ ³); also in Na 12-10 Pastor Frohnmeyer of Württemberg (ob. 1880) detected traces of an alphabetic arrangement, but the attempt of Gunkel, Bickell, Arnold (*ZAW*. 1901,

¹ On the supposed connexion of this artificial arrangement with magical formulae ('the order of the letters was believed to have a sort of magic power') cf. Löhr, *ZAW*. 1905, p. 173 ff., and *Klagelieder*², Gött. 1907, p. vii ff.

² On this superfluous β cf. Grimme, *Euphemistic liturgical appendices*, Lpz. 1901, p. 8 ff., and Nestle, *ZAW*. 1903, p. 340 f., who considers it an appendage to the Greek alphabet.

³ [Perhaps also originally in ψ 34.] β before γ is probably due to a magic alphabet, see above, n. 1. According to Böhmer, *ZAW*. 1908, p. 53 ff., the combinations $\alpha\alpha$, $\eta\eta$, $\eta\eta$, &c., were used in magical texts; $\beta\gamma$ was excluded, but by a rearrangement we get $\eta\beta$ and $\gamma\gamma$.

p. 225 ff.), Happel (*Der Ps. Nah.*, Würzb. 1900) to discover further traces, has not been successful. [Cf. Gray in *Expositor*, 1898, p. 207 ff.; Driver, in the Century Bible, *Nahum*, p. 26.]—Bickell, *Ztschr. f. Kath. Theol.*, 1882, p. 319 ff., had already deduced from the versions the alphabetical character of Ecclesiastes 51¹³⁻²⁰, with the omission of the 1-verse and with 2¹ at the end. His conjectures have been brilliantly confirmed by the discovery of the Hebrew original, although the order from 1 to 2 is partly disturbed or obscured. If 1 before 2 is deleted, ten letters are in their right positions, and seven can be restored to their places with certainty. Cf. N. Schlögl, *ZDMG.* 53, 669 ff.; C. Taylor in the appendix to Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, Cambr. 1899, p. lxxvi ff., and in the *Journ. of Philol.*, xxx (1906), p. 95 ff.; *JQR.* 1905, p. 238 ff.; Lühr, *ZAW.* 1905, p. 183 ff.; I. Lévy, *REJ.* 1907, p. 62 ff.

The sequence of the three softest labial, palatal, and dental sounds ב, ג, ד, and of the three liquids ל, מ, נ, indicates an attempt at classification. At the same time other considerations also appear to have had influence. Thus it is certainly not accidental, that two letters, representing a hand (*Yôd*, *Kaph*), as also two (if *Qôph* = back of the head) which represent the head, and in general several forms denoting objects naturally connected (*Mêm* and *Nûn*, *‘Ayin* and *Pê*), stand next to one another.

i The order, names, and numerical values of the letters have passed over from the Phoenicians to the Greeks, in whose alphabet the letters A to T are borrowed from the Old Semitic. So also the Old Italic alphabets as well as the Roman, and consequently all alphabets derived either from this or from the Greek, are directly or indirectly dependent on the Phoenician.

k 3. a. In default of special arithmetical figures, the consonants were used also as numerical signs; cf. G. Gundermann, *Die Zahlzeichen*, Giessen, 1899, p. 6 f., and Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i. 106 ff. The earliest traces of this usage are, however, first found on the Maccabean coins (see above, § 2 d, end). These numerical letters were afterwards commonly employed, e.g. for marking the numbers of chapters and verses in the editions of the Bible. The units are denoted by א-ט, the tens by י-צ, 100-400 by ק-ת, the numbers from 500-900 by ח (= 400), with the addition of the remaining hundreds, e.g. תק 500. In compound numbers the greater precedes (on the right), thus יא 11, קכא 121. But 15 is expressed by טו 9+6, not יה (which is a form of the divine name, being the first two consonants of יהוה).² For a similar reason טז is also mostly written for 16, instead of יז, which in compound proper names, like יואל, also represents the name of God, יהוה.

The thousands are sometimes denoted by the units with two dots placed above, e.g. ס̣ 1000.

l b. The reckoning of the years in Jewish writings (generally ליצירה after the creation) follows either the full chronology (לפ' ג' or לפ' ג'רל), with the addition of the thousands, or the abridged chronology (לפ' קטן), in which they are omitted. In the dates of the first thousand years after Christ, the Christian era is obtained by the addition of 240, in the second thousand years by the addition of 1240 (i. e. if the date falls between Jan. 1 and the Jewish new year; otherwise add 1239), the thousands of the Creation era being omitted.

m 4. Abbreviations of words are not found in the text of the O. T., but they occur on coins, and their use is extremely frequent amongst the later Jews.³

¹ See note 3 on p. 29.

² On the rise of this custom (יה having been originally used and afterwards יה), cf. Nestle in *ZAW.* 1884, p. 250, where a trace of this method of writing occurring as early as Origen is noted.

³ Cf. Jo. Buxtorf, *De abbreviaturis Hebr.*, Basel, 1613, &c.; Pietro Perreau,

A point, or later an oblique stroke, serves as the sign of abridgement in old MSS. and editions, e. g. יִשְׂרָאֵל for יִשְׂרָאֵל, פִּלְגִּי for פִּלְגִּי, aliquid, דָּבָר for דָּבָר, aliquid, וְגוֹ for וְגוֹמֵר et complens, i. e. and so on. Also in the middle of what is apparently a word, such strokes indicate that it is an abbreviation or a *vox memorialis* (cf. e. g. § 15 d תָּא"ם). Two such strokes are employed, from § 4 i d onward, to mark the different classes of weak verbs.—Note also יִי or יִי (also יִהְיֶה) for יִהְיֶה.

5. Peculiarities in the tradition of the O. T. text, which are already *n* mentioned in the Talmud, are—(1) The 15 *puncta extraordinaria*, about which the tradition (from Siphri on Nu 9¹⁰ onwards) differs considerably, even as to their number; on particular consonants, Gn 16⁵, 18⁹, 19³³⁻³⁵, Nu 9¹⁰; or on whole words, Gn 33⁴, 37¹², Nu 3³⁹, 21³⁰, 29¹⁵, Dt 29²⁸, 2 S 19²⁰, Is 44⁹, Ez 41²⁰, 46²², ψ 27¹³,—all no doubt critical marks; cf. Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 88 ff.; L. Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, Strassburg, 1891, p. 6 ff., and *Einleitung in die hl. Schrift*, Budapest, 1894; Königsberger, *Jüd. Lit.-Blatt*, 1891, nos. 29-31, and *Aus Masorah u. Talmudkritik*, Berlin, 1892, p. 6 ff.; Mayer-Lambert, *REJ.* 30 (1895), no. 59; and especially Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 318 ff.; also on the ten points found in the Pentateuch, see Butin (Baltimore, 1906), who considers that they are as old as the Christian era and probably mark a letter, &c., to be deleted. (2) The *litterae majusculae* (e. g. ב Gn 1¹, ו Lv 11⁴² as the middle consonant of the Pentateuch, י Nu 14¹⁷), and *minusculae* (e. g. ה Gn 2⁴). (3) The *litterae suspensae* (Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 334 ff.) נ Ju 18³⁰ (which points to the reading מִנְשָׁה for מִנְשָׁה, ע ψ 80¹⁴ (the middle of the Psalms¹) and Jb 38¹³⁻¹⁵). (4) The 'mutilated' *Wāw* שְׁלוֹם Nu 25¹², and ק Ex 32²⁵ (בְּקִמּוֹהֶם), and Nu 7² (הַפְּקוּדִים). (5) *Mēm clausum* in לְמַרְבָּה Is 9⁶, and *Mēm apertum* in הַמִּפְרֹצִים Neh 2¹³. (6) *Nūn inversum* before Nu 10³⁵, and after ver. 36, as also before ψ 107²³⁻²⁸ and 40; according to Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 341 ff., a sort of bracket to indicate that the verses are out of place; cf. Krauss, *ZAW.* 1902, p. 57 ff., who regards the inverted *Nūns* as an imitation of the Greek obelus.

§ 6. Pronunciation and Division of Consonants.

P. Haupt, 'Die Semit. Sprachlaute u. ihre Umschrift,' in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie u. vergleich. semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, by Delitzsch and Haupt, i, Lpz. 1889, 249 ff.; E. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i, Lpz. 1901, p. 14 ff.

1. An accurate knowledge of the original phonetic value of each *a* consonant is of the greatest importance, since very many grammatical peculiarities and changes (§ 18 ff.) only become intelligible from the nature and pronunciation of the sounds. This knowledge is obtained partly from the pronunciation of the kindred dialects, especially the still living Arabic, partly by observing the affinity and interchange

*Oceano delle abbreviature e sigle*², Parma, 1883 (appendix, 1884); Ph. Lederer, *Hebr. u. Chald. Abbreviaturen*, Frankf. 1893; Händler, *Lexicon d. Abbreviaturen* (annexed to G. Dalman's *Aram.-neuhebr. WB.*, Frankf. 1897); Leviaš, art. 'Abbreviations,' in the *Jew. Encycl.*, i. 39 ff.; F. Perles, 'Zur Gesch. der Abbrev. im Hebr.' (*Archiv f. Stenogr.*, 1902, p. 41 ff.). On abbreviations in biblical MSS. see Ginsburg, *Introd.*, 165 ff.

¹ According to Blau, *Studien zum althebr. Buchwesen*, Strassburg, 1902, p. 167, properly a large ו, called *t'ūyā* because suspended between the two halves of the Psalter, and then incorrectly taken for a *littera suspensa*.

of sounds on Hebrew itself (§ 19), and partly from the tradition of the Jews.¹

The pronunciation of Hebrew by the modern German Jews, which partly resembles the Syriac and is generally called 'Polish', differs considerably from that of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, which approaches nearer to the Arabic. The pronunciation of Hebrew by Christians follows the latter (after the example of Reuchlin), in almost all cases.

b The oldest tradition is presented in the transcription of Hebrew names in Assyrian cuneiform; a later, but yet in its way very important system is seen in the manner in which the LXX transcribe Hebrew names with Greek letters.² As, however, corresponding signs for several sounds (א, ע, צ, פ, ש) are wanting in the Greek alphabet, only an approximate representation was possible in these cases. The same applies to the Latin transcription of Hebrew words by Jerome, according to the Jewish pronunciation of his time.³

On the pronunciation of the modern Jews in North Africa, see Bargès in the *Journ. Asiat.*, Nov. 1848; on that of the South Arabian Jews, J. Dérenbourg, *Manuel du lecteur*, &c. (from a Yemen MS. of the year 1390), Paris, 1871 (extrait 6 du *Journ. Asiat.* 1870).

c 2. With regard to the pronunciation of the several gutturals and sibilants, and of א and פ, it may be remarked:—

1. Among the gutturals, the glottal stop א is the lightest, corresponding to the *spiritus lenis* of the Greeks. It may stand either at the beginning or end of a syllable, e. g. אָמַר 'āmār, יָאֲשֹׁם yā'sām. Even before a vowel א is almost lost to our ear, like the *h* in *hour* and in the French *habit, homme*. After a vowel א generally (and at the end of a word, always) coalesces with it, e. g. קָרָא qārā for an original qārā', Arab. qārā'ā; see further, § 23 a, 27 g.

d ה before a vowel corresponds exactly to our *h* (*spiritus asper*); after a vowel it is either a guttural (so always at the end of a syllable which is not final, e. g. נֶחֱפֶק nēphēk; at the end of a word the consonantal ה has a point—Mappiq—in it, see § 14), or it stands inaudible at the end of a word, generally as a mere orthographic indication of a preceding vowel, e. g. גָּלָה gālā; cf. §§ 7 b and 75 a.

e ע is related to א, but is a much stronger guttural. Its strongest sound is a rattled, guttural *g*, cf. e. g. עֵינַי 'ēnāy, LXX ἑἰνῆ Γόμορρα; elsewhere, a weaker sound of the same kind, which the LXX reproduce by a *spiritus* (*lenis* or *asper*), e. g. עָלַי 'ēlāy, ἑλῆ Αμαλέκ.⁴ In the mouth of the Arabs one hears in the former case a sort of guttural *r*, in the latter a sound peculiar to themselves formed in the back of the throat.—It is as incorrect to omit the ע

¹ Cf. C. Meinhof, 'Die Aussprache des Hebr.,' in *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Pädag.*, 1885, Bd. 132, p. 146 ff.; M. Schreiner, 'Zur Gesch. der Ausspr. des Hebr.,' in *ZAW.* 1886, p. 213 ff.

² Cf. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuag.*, Lpz. 1841, p. 90 ff.; C. Könneke, 'Gymn.-Progr.,' Stargard, 1885. On the transcription of eleven Psalms in a palimpsest fragment of the Hexapla at Milan, see Mercati, *Atti della R. Accad.*, xxxi, Turin, 1896. [Cf. Burkitt, *Fragments of . . . Aquila*, Cambr. 1897, p. 13.]

³ Numerous examples occur in *Hieronymi quaestiones hebraicae in libro geneseos*, edited by P. de Lagarde, Lpz. 1868; cf. the exhaustive and systematic discussion by Siegfried, 'Die Aussprache des Hebr. bei Hieronymus,' in *ZAW.* 1884, pp. 34-83.

⁴ It is, however, doubtful if the LXX always consciously aimed at reproducing the actual differences of sound.

entirely, in reading and transcribing words (עֲלִי *Eli*, עֲמֶלֶק *Amalek*), as to pronounce it exactly like *g* or like *■* nasal *ng*. The stronger sound might be approximately transcribed by *gh* or *ʔg*; but since in Hebrew the softer sound was the more common, it is sufficient to represent it by the sign ' as אֲרָבַע 'arba', עַד 'ad.

ח is the strongest guttural sound, a deep guttural *ch*, as heard generally *f* in Swiss German, somewhat as in the German *Achat*, *Macht*, *Sache*, *Docht*, *Zucht* (not as in *Licht*, *Knecht*), and similar to the Spanish *j*. Like ע it was, however, pronounced in many words feebly, in others strongly.

As regards ח, its pronunciation as a palatal (with a vibrating uvula) seems *g* to have been the prevailing one. Hence in some respects it is also classed with the gutturals (§ 22 *q, r*). On the lingual ח, cf. § 6 *o*.

2. The Hebrew language is unusually rich in sibilants. These have, at any *h* rate in some cases, arisen from dentals which are retained as such in Aramaic and Arabic (see in the *Lexicon* the letters ט, צ and ש).

ש and ש were originally represented (as is still the case in the unpointed *i* texts) by only one form ש; but that the use of this one form to express two different sounds (at least in Hebrew) was due only to the poverty of the alphabet, is clear from the fact that they are differentiated in Arabic and Ethiopic (cf. Nöldeke in *Ztschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1873, p. 121; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 133). In the Masoretic punctuation they were distinguished by means of the diacritical point as ש (sh) and ש (s).¹

The original difference between the sounds ש and ש² sometimes marks *h* a distinction in meaning, e.g. סָכַר to close, שָׁכַר to hire, סָכַל to be foolish, שָׁכַל to be prudent, to be wise. Syriac always represents both sounds by ס, and in Hebrew also they are sometimes interchanged; as סָכַר for שָׁכַר to hire, Ezr 4⁵; שָׁכִלוֹת for סָכִלוֹת *folly*, Ec 1⁷.

י (transcribed ζ by the LXX) is a soft whizzing *s*, the French and English *z*, *l* altogether different from the German *z* (*ts*).

3. ט, ק, and probably צ are pronounced with a strong articulation and *m* with a compression of the larynx. The first two are thus essentially different from ת and כ, which correspond to our *t* and *k* and also are often aspirated (see below, *n*). צ is distinguished from every other *s* by its peculiar articulation, and in no way corresponds to the German *z* or *ts*; we transcribe it by *z*; cf. G. Hüsing, 'Zum Lautwerte des צ,' in *OLZ*. x. 467 ff.

3. Six consonants, the weak and middle hard Palatals, Dentals, *n* and Labials

ב ג ד כ פ ת (בְּגִדְכֶפֶת)

have a twofold pronunciation, (1) a harder sound, as mutes, like

¹ The modern Samaritans, however, in reading their Hebrew Pentateuch pronounce ש invariably as ש.

² The original value of ט, and its relation to the original value of ש and ש, is still undetermined, despite the valuable investigations of P. Haupt, *ZDMG*. 1880, p. 762 f.; D. H. Müller, 'Zur Geschichte der semit. Zischlaute,' in the *Verhandlungen des Wiener Orient. Congresses*, Vienna, 1888, Semitic section, p. 229 ff.; De Lagarde, 'Samech,' in the *NGGW*. 1891, no. 5, esp. p. 173; Aug. Müller, *ZAW*. 1891, p. 267 ff.; Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. 1893, p. 100 f.; E. Glaser, *Zwei Wiener Publicationen über Habaschitisch-punische Dialekte in Südarabien*, Munich, 1902, pp. 19 ff.—On the phonetic value of צ see G. Hüsing, *OLZ*. 1907, p. 467 ff.

k, *p*, *t*, or initial *b*, *g* (hard), *d*; and (2) a softer sound as *spirantes*.¹ The harder sound is the original. It is retained at the beginning of syllables, when there is no vowel immediately preceding to influence the pronunciation, and is denoted by a point, *Dageš lene* (§ 13), placed in the consonants, viz. ב *b*, ג *g*, ד *d*, כ *k*, פ *p*, ת *t*. The weaker pronunciation appears as soon as a vowel sound immediately precedes. It is occasionally denoted, esp. in MSS., by *Rāphè* (§ 14 e), but in printed texts usually by the mere absence of the *Dageš*. In the case of ב, ג, פ, ת, the two sounds are clearly distinguishable even to our ear as *b* and *v*, *k* and German (weak) *ch*, *p* and *ph*, *t* and *th* (in *thin*). The Greeks too express this twofold pronunciation by special characters: כ *κ*, ג *χ*; פ *π*, ד *φ*; ת *τ*, ת *θ*. In the same way ג should be pronounced like the North German *g* in *Tage*, *Wagen*, and ת like *th* in *the*, as distinguished from ג and ת.

For more precise information on the cases in which the one or the other pronunciation takes place, see § 21. The modern Jews pronounce the aspirated ב as *v*, the aspirated ת as *s*, e.g. רב *rav* (or even *raf*), בַּיִת *bais*. The customary transcription (used also in this Grammar) of the spirants ב, ג, ת by *bh*, *kh*, *th* is only an unsatisfactory makeshift, since it may lead (esp. in the case of *bh* and *kh*) to an erroneous conception of the sounds as real aspirates, *b-h*, *k-h*.

o 4. According to their special character the consonants are divided into—

(a) Gutturals	א ה ע ה ;
(b) Palatals	ק ג ב ;
(c) Dentals	ת ט ד ;
(d) Labials	פ ב ;
(e) Sibilants	צ ש ס ז ;
(f) Sonants	נ מ , ר ל , ו י

In the case of ר its hardest pronunciation as a *palatal* (see above, *g*, end) is to be distinguished from its more unusual sound as a *lingual*, pronounced in the front of the mouth.

On the twofold pronunciation of *r* in Tiberias, cf. Delitzsch, *Physiol. und Musik*, Lpz. 1868, p. 10 ff.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-l'lamim*, Lpz. 1879, p. 5, note a, and § 7 of the Hebrew text, as well as p. 82.

p In accordance with E. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 14, the following scheme of the Hebrew phonetic system is substituted for the table formerly given in this grammar:—

i. Throat sounds (Gutturals): א ה ע ה .

¹ So at any rate at the time when the present punctuation arose.

ii. Mouth-sounds:

	w.	m.	e.	w.	m.
1. Mutes and Spirants:					
Palatal	ק	כ	ק	ג	כ
Dental	ד	ת	ט	ד	ת
Labial	ב	■	—	ב	פ
2. Sibilants:	... ו	ש שם	צ		
3. Sonants:	... וי	ל ר	נ מ		

Rem. 1. The meaning of the letters at the top is, w. = weak, m. = middle hard, e. = emphatic. Consonants which are produced by the same organ of speech are called *homorganic* (e.g. ק and כ as palatals), consonants whose sound is of the same nature *homogeneous* (e.g. ו and י as semi-vowels). On their homorganic character and homogeneity depends the possibility of interchange, whether within Hebrew itself or with the kindred dialects. In such cases the soft sound generally interchanges with the soft, the hard with the hard, &c. (e.g. ד = ו, ת = ש, ט = צ). Further transitions are not, however, excluded, as e.g. the interchange of ת and ק (ת = כ = ק). Here it is of importance to observe whether the change takes place in an initial, medial, or final letter; since e.g. the change in ■ letter when medial does not always prove the possibility of the change when initial. That in certain cases the character of the consonantal sound also influences the preceding or following vowel will be noticed in the accidence as the instances occur.

Rem. 2. Very probably in course of time certain nicer distinctions of *r* pronunciation became more and more neglected and finally were lost. Thus e.g. the stronger ׀ *g*, which was known to the LXX (see above, e), became in many cases altogether lost to the later Jews; by the Samaritans and Galileans ׀ and ׀ were pronounced merely as ׀, and so in Ethiopic, ׀ like ׀, ׀ like ׀, ׀ like ׀.

Rem. 3. The consonants which it is usual to describe especially as *weak*, *s* are those which readily coalesce with a preceding vowel to form a long vowel, viz. ׀, ו, י (as to ׀, cf. § 23 k), or those which are most frequently affected by the changes described in § 19 b-l, as again ׀, ו, י, and ׀, and in certain cases ׀ and ׀; finally the gutturals and ד for the reason given in § 22 b and q.

§ 7. The Vowels in General, Vowel Letters and Vowel Signs.

1. The original vowels in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic tongues, *a* are *a*, *i*, *u*. *E* and *o* always arise from an obscuring or contraction of these three pure sounds, viz. *e* by modification from *i* or *ā*; short *ō* from *ū*; *ê* by contraction from *ai* (properly *ay*); and *ô* sometimes by modification (obscuring) from *ā*, sometimes by contraction from *au* (properly *aw*).¹

In Arabic writing there are vowel signs only for *a*, *i*, *u*; the combined sounds *ay* and *aw* are therefore retained uncontracted and pronounced as diphthongs (*ai* and *au*), e.g. שׂוּט Arab. *saut*, and עֵינַיִן Arab. *ainain*. It was

¹ In proper names the LXX often use the diphthongs *ai* and *au* where the Hebrew form has *e* or *ō*. It is, however, very doubtful whether the *ai* and *au* of the LXX really represent the true pronunciation of Hebrew of that time; see the instructive statistics given by Kittel in Haupt's *SBOT.*, on 1 Ch 1²⁻²⁰.

only in later Arabic that they became in pronunciation *é* and *ô*, at least after weaker or softer consonants; cf. בַּיִן Arab. *bain*, *bên*, יָדִים Arab. *yayim*, *yôm*. The same contraction appears also in other languages, e.g. in Greek and Latin (*θαῦμα*, Ionic *θῶμα*; *plaustrum* = *plostrum*), in the French pronunciation of *ai* and *au*, and likewise in the German popular dialects (*Oge* for *Auge*, &c.). Similarly, the obscuring of the vowels plays a part in various languages (cf. e.g. the *a* in modern Persian, Swedish, English, &c.).¹

b 2. The partial expression of the vowels by certain consonants (ה, ו, י; א), which sufficed during the lifetime of the language, and for a still longer period afterwards (cf. § 1 k), must in the main have passed through the following stages² :—

(a) The need of a written indication of the vowel first made itself felt in cases where, after the rejection of a consonant, or of an entire syllable, a long vowel formed the final sound of the word. The first step in such a case was to retain the original final consonant, at least as a vowel letter, i. e. merely as an indication of a final vowel. In point of fact we find even in the Old Testament, as already in the Mēša' inscription, a ה employed in this way (see below) as an indication of a final *o*. From this it was only a step to the employment of the same consonant to indicate also other vowels when final (thus, e.g. in the inflection of the verbs הָלַךְ, the vowels *ā*,³ *ē*, *è*). After the employment of ו as a vowel letter for *ô* and *u*, and of י for *ê* and *î*, had been established (see below, e) these consonants were also employed—although not consistently—for the same vowels at the end of a word.

c According to § 91 b and d, the suffix of the 3rd sing. masc. in the noun (as in the verb) was originally pronounced הַי. But in the places where this הַי with a preceding *a* is contracted into *ô* (after the rejection of the ה), we find the ה still frequently retained as a vowel letter, e.g. סוֹתָה, עִירָה Gn 49¹¹, cf. § 91 e; so throughout the Mēša' inscription אֶרְצָה, בֵּיתָה (also בֵּיתָה), בָּנָה, לָהּ, הַלְתָּמָה; on the other hand already in the Siloam inscription רָעוּ.⁴ מֵשָׁא, l. 8 = יָמָיו *his days* is unusual, as also רָשָׁה l. 20 if it is for ראשֵׁיו *his chiefs*. The verbal forms with ה suffixed are to be read וַיְהִלְפָה (l. 6), וַאֲסַחְבָה (l. 12 f.) and וַיְנַרְשָׁה (l. 19).

d As an example of the original consonant being retained, we might also include the י of the constr. state plur. masc. if its *ê* (according to § 89 d) is

¹ In Sanskrit, in the Old Persian cuneiform, and in Ethiopic, short *a* alone of all the vowels is not represented, but the consonant by itself is pronounced with short *a*.

² Cf. especially Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, p. 34 ff.

³ According to Stade, the employment of ה for *ā* probably took place first in the case of the locative accusatives which originally ended in הָ, as אֶרְצָה, קְרִימָה.

⁴ The form רָעוּ contradicts the view of Oort, *Theol. Tijds.*, 1902, p. 374, that the above instances from the Mēša'-inscription are to be read *benhu*, *bahu*, *lahu*, which were afterwards vocalized as *beno*, *bo*, *lo*.

contracted from an original *ay*. Against this, however, it may be urged that the Phœnician inscriptions do not usually express this *ê*, nor any other final vowel.¹

(b) The employment of ו to denote *ô*, ו and of י to denote *ê*, *î*, may *e* have resulted from those cases in which a ו with a preceding *a* was contracted into *au* and further to *ô*, or with a preceding *u* coalesced into *û*, and where י with *a* has been contracted into *ai* and further to *ê*, or with a preceding *i* into *î* (cf. § 24). In this case the previously existing consonants were retained as vowel letters and were further applied at the end of the word to denote the respective long vowels. Finally מ also will in the first instance have established itself as a vowel letter only where a consonantal מ with a preceding *a* had coalesced into *â* or *ā*.

The orthography of the Siloam inscription corresponds almost exactly with the above assumptions. Here (as in the Mēša' inscr.) we find all the long vowels, which have not arisen from original diphthongs, *without* vowel letters, thus אש, הוצבם, מימן, (or מימן); אמת, קל, שלש, צר. On the other hand מוצא (from *mausa'*), עור (from *'aud*); מימן also, if it is to be read מימן, is an instance of the retention of a ו which has coalesced with *i* into *î*. Instances of the retention of an originally consonantal מ as a vowel letter are מאתים, מוצא, and קרא, as also ראש. Otherwise final *ā* is always represented by ה: נקבה, ורה, יהי, אמה: ה. To this י alone would form an exception (cf. however the note on יום, § 96), instead of יום (Arab. *yaum*) *day*, which one would expect. If the reading be correct, this is to be regarded as an argument that a consciousness of the origin of many long vowels was lost at an early period, so that (at least in the middle of the word) the vowel letters were omitted in places where they should stand, according to what has been stated above, and added where there was no case of contraction. This view is in a great measure confirmed by the orthography of the Mēša' inscription. There we find, as might be expected, ריבן (= *Daibōn*, as the Δαιβόν of the LXX proves), הורבן (*ô* from *au*), and ביתה (*ê* from *ai*), but also even השעני² instead of הושעני (from *haus-*), וואשיב=ואשב, four times, ביתה once, for בית and ביתה (from *bait*); ללה=לילה, אן=אין or אין.

¹ Thus there occurs, e.g. in Melit. i, l. 3 שבננ = שני בני the two sons; elsewhere כ for פ (but כ in the Mēša' and Siloam inscr.), ו for וה (the latter in the Siloam inscr.), בנת = בנתי (so Mēša') or בנתי, &c. Cf. on the other hand in Mēša', אנכ = אנכי (unless it was actually pronounced *'anōkh* by the Moabites!). As final *ā* is represented by ה and מ and final *î* by י, so final *û* is almost everywhere expressed by ו in Mēša', and always in the Siloam inscription. It is indeed not impossible that Hebrew orthography also once passed through a period in which the final vowels were left always or sometimes undenoted, and that not a few strange forms in the present text of the Bible are to be explained from the fact that subsequently the vowel letters (especially ו and י) were not added in all cases. So Chwolson, 'Die Quiescentia הוי in der althebr. Orthogr.,' in *Travaux du Congrès... des Orientalistes*, Petersb. 1876; cf. numerous instances in Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 146 ff.

² השעני is the more strange since the name of king הושע is represented as *A-u si'* in cuneiform as late as 728 B.C.

g (c) In the present state of Old Testament vocalization as it appears in the Masoretic text, the striving after a certain uniformity cannot be mistaken, in spite of the inconsistencies which have crept in. Thus the final long vowel is, with very few exceptions (cf. § 9 d, and the very doubtful cases in § 8 k), indicated by a vowel letter—and almost always by the same letter in certain nominal and verbal endings. In many cases the use of *י* to mark an *ô* or *û*, arising from contraction, and of *י* for *ê* or *î*, is by far the more common, while we seldom find an originally consonantal *ס* rejected, and the simple phonetic principle taking the place of the historical orthography. On the other hand the number of exceptions is very great. In many cases (as e.g. in the plural endings *ם*— and *ים*) the vowel letters are habitually employed to express long vowels which do not arise through contraction, and we even find short vowels indicated. The conclusion is, that if there ever was a period of Hebrew writing when the application of fixed laws to all cases was intended, either these laws were not consistently carried out in the further transmission of the text, or errors and confusion afterwards crept into it. Moreover much remained uncertain even in texts which were plentifully provided with vowel letters. For, although in most cases the context was a guide to the correct reading, yet there were also cases where, of the many possible ways of pronouncing a word, more than one appeared admissible.¹

h 3. When the language had died out, the ambiguity of such a writing must have been found continually more troublesome; and as there was thus a danger that the correct pronunciation might be finally lost, the vowel signs or vowel points were invented in order to fix it. By means of these points everything hitherto left uncertain was most accurately settled. It is true that there is no historical account of the date of this vocalization of the O. T. text, yet we may at least infer, from a comparison of other historical facts, that it was gradually developed by Jewish grammarians in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. under the influence of different Schools, traces of which have been preserved to the present time in various differences of tradition.² They mainly followed, though with independent regard to

¹ Thus e.g. *שׁוּב* can be read *qāṭal*, *qāṭāl*, *qāṭōl*, *qēṭōl*, *qōṭel*, *qittēl*, *qattēl*, *quṭṭal*, *qēṭel*, and several of these forms have also different senses.

² The most important of these differences are, (a) those between the Orientals, i. e. the scholars of the Babylonian Schools, and the Occidentals, i. e. the scholars of Palestine (Tiberias, &c.); cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 197 ff.; (b) amongst the Occidentals, between Ben-Naphtali and Ben-Asher, who flourished in the first half of the tenth century at Tiberias; cf. Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 241 ff. Both sets of variants are given by Baer in the appendices

the peculiar nature of the Hebrew, the example and pattern of the older Syrian punctuation.¹

See Gesenius, *Gesch. d. hebr. Spr.*, p. 182 ff.; Hupfeld, in *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1830, pt. iii, who shows that neither Jerome nor the Talmud mentions vowel signs; Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm. im Talm. u. Midrasch*, p. 26 ff.; and B. Pick, in *Hebraica*, i. 3, p. 153 ff.; Abr. Geiger, 'Zur Nakdanim-[Punctuators]-Literatur,' in *Jüd. Ztschr. für Wissensch. u. Leben*, x. Breslau, 1872, p. 10 ff.; H. Strack, *Prolegomena critica in Vet. Test. Hebr.*, Lips. 1873; 'Beitrag zur Gesch. des hebr. Bibeltextes,' in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1875, p. 736 ff., as also in the *Ztschr. f. die ges. luth. Theol. u. K.*, 1875, p. 619 ff.; 'Massorah,' in the *Protest. Real.-Enc.*³, xii. 393 ff. (a good outline); A. Merx, in the *Verhandlungen des Orientalistenkongresses zu Berlin*, i. Berlin, 1881, p. 164 ff. and p. 188 ff.; H. Graetz, 'Die Anfänge der Vokalzeichen im Hebr.,' in *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.*, 1881, pp. 348 ff. and 395 ff.; Hersmann, *Zur Gesch. des Streites über die Entstehung der hebr. Punctuation*, Ruhrort, 1885; Harris, 'The Rise . . . of the Massorah,' *JQR.* i. 1889, p. 128 ff. and p. 223 ff.; Mayer-Lambert, *REJ.* xxvi. 1893, p. 274 ff.; J. Bachrach, *Das Alter d. bibl. Vocalisation u. Accentuation*, 2 pts. Warsaw, 1897, and esp. Ginsburg, *Introd.* (see § 3 c), p. 287 ff.; Budde, 'Zur Gesch. d. Tiberiens. Vocalisation,' in *Orient. Studien zu Ehren Th. Nöldekes*, i. 1906, 651 ff.; Bacher, 'Diakrit. Zeichen in vormasoret. Zeit,' in *ZAW.* 1907, p. 285; C. Levias, art. 'Vocalization,' in the *Jewish Encycl.*—On the hypothesis of the origin of punctuation in the Jewish schools for children, cf. J. Dérenbourg in the *Rev. Crit.*, xiii. 1879, no. 25.

4. To complete the historical vocalization of the consonantal text ⁱ a phonetic system was devised, so exact as to show all vowel-changes occasioned by lengthening of words, by the tone, by gutturals, &c., which in other languages are seldom indicated in writing. The pronunciation followed is in the main that of the Palestinian Jews of about the sixth century A.D., as observed in the solemn reading of the sacred writings in synagogue and school, but based on a much older tradition. That the real pronunciation of early Hebrew is consistently preserved by this tradition, has recently been seriously questioned on good grounds, especially in view of the transcription of proper names in the LXX. Nevertheless in many cases, internal reasons, as well as the analogy of the kindred languages, testify in a high degree to the faithfulness of the tradition. At the same recension of the text, or soon after, the various other signs for reading (§§ 11–14, 16) were added, and the accents (§ 15).

§ 8. The Vowel Signs in particular.

P. Haupt, 'The names of the Hebrew vowels,' *JAOS.* xxii, and in the *Johns Hopkins Semitic Papers*, Newhaven, 1901, p. 7 ff.; C. Levias in the *Hebr. Union Coll. Annual*, Cincinnati, 1904, p. 138 ff.

to his critical editions. Our printed editions present uniformly the text of Ben-Asher, with the exception of a few isolated readings of Ben-Naphtali, and of numerous later corruptions.

¹ See Geiger, 'Massorah bei d. Syrern,' in *ZDMG.* 1873, p. 148 ff.; J. P. Martin, *Hist. de la ponctuation ou de la Massore chez les Syriens*, Par. 1875; E. Nestle, in *ZDMG.* 1876, p. 525 ff.; Weingarten, *Die syr. Massora nach Bar Hebraeus*, Halle, 1887.

Preliminary Remark.

The next two sections (§§ 8 and 9) have been severely criticized (Philippi, *ThLZ.* 1897, no. 2) for assigning a definite quantity to each of the several vowels, whereas in reality — , — , — are merely signs for \bar{a} , e , o : 'whether these are long or short is not shown by the signs themselves but must be inferred from the rules for the pause which marks the breaks in continuous narrative, or from other circumstances.' But in the twenty-fourth and subsequent German editions of this Grammar, in the last note on § 8 a [English ed. p. 38, note 4], it was stated: 'it must be mentioned that the Masoretes are not concerned with any distinction between long and short vowels, or in general with any question of quantity. Their efforts are directed to fixing the received pronunciation as faithfully as possible, by means of writing.

For a long time only שבעה מלכים *seven kings* were reckoned (*vox memor.* in Elias Levita: וַיֵּאָמֶר אֱלִיהֵוּ, Šureq and Qibbuš being counted as one vowel.

The division of the vowels in respect of quantity is a later attempt at a scientific conception of the phonetic system, which was not invented but only represented by the Masoretes (Qimchi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenb. 136 a, distinguishes the five long as *mothers* from their five daughters).

I have therefore long shared the opinion that 'the vowel-system represented by the ordinary punctuation (of Tiberias) was primarily intended to mark only differences of quality' (Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 17). There is, however, of course a further question how far these 'later' grammarians were mistaken in assigning a particular quantity to the vowels represented by particular signs. In Philippi's opinion they were mistaken (excluding of course \hat{i} , \hat{e} , \hat{o} when written *plene*) in a very great number of cases, since not only does — stand, according to circumstances, for \bar{a} or \check{a} , and — for \bar{a} or \check{a} , but also — for \bar{e} or \check{e} , and — for \bar{o} or \check{o} , e. g. פָּבֵר and קָטֵן, out of pause *kābēd*, *qāṭōn* (form קָטֵן), but in pause *kābēd*, *qāṭōn*.

I readily admit, with regard to *Qameš* and *S^egol*, that the account formerly given in § 8 f. was open to misconstruction. With regard to *Sere* and *Holem*, however, I can only follow Philippi so long as his view does not conflict with the (to me inviolable) law of a long vowel in an open syllable before the tone and (except *Pathah*) in a final syllable with the tone. To me פָּבֵר = *kābēd*, &c., is as impossible as e. g. עֵנָב = *ʿenab* or בֶּרַךְ = *bōrakh*, in spite of the analogy cited by Sievers (p. 18, note 1) that 'in old German e. g. original \hat{i} and \hat{u} often pass into \check{e} and \check{o} dialectically, while remaining in a closed syllable.

- a 1. The full vowels (in contrast to the half-vowels or vowel trills, § 10 a-f), classified according to the three principal vowel sounds (§ 7 a), are as follows:—

First Class. A-sound.

- A { 1. — ¹ *Qāmēš* denotes either \bar{a} , \check{a} , more strictly \bar{a} (the obscure Swedish \check{a}) and \hat{a} ,² as יָ *yād* (hand), ראשִׁים *rā'sēm* (heads), or \check{a} (in future transcribed as \check{o}), called *Qāmēš ḥātūph*, i. e. hurried *Qameš*. The latter occurs almost exclusively as a modification of \check{u} ; cf. c and § 9 u.
2. — *Páthāh*, \check{a} , בַּת *bāth* (daughter).

¹ In early MSS. the sign for *Qameš* is a stroke with a point underneath, i. e. according to Nestle's discovery (*ZDMG.* 1892, p. 411 f.), *Pathah* with *Holem*, the latter suggesting the obscure pronunciation of *Qameš* as \check{a} . Cf. also Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 609.

² Instead of the no doubt more accurate transcription \bar{a} , \hat{a} we have

Also 3. ֿ *Segôl*, an open *e*, ֿ (\bar{a} or \check{a}), as a modification of \check{a} ,¹ either in an untuned closed syllable, as in the first syllable of יָדְכֶם *yădikhēm* (your hand) from *yădikhēm*—or in a tone-syllable as in $\text{פְּסָחַ$ *pēsah*; cf. $\pi\acute{o}\sigma\chi\alpha$, and on the really monosyllabic character of such formations, see § 28 e. But *Segôl* in an open tone-syllable with a following ֿ , as in גֵּלְנָה *gēlēnā* (cf. § 75 f), יָדְכֶהָ *yădēkhā* (cf. § 91 i), is due to contraction from *ay*.

Second Class. I- and E-sounds.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| I | { | 1. ֿ <i>Hîrēq</i> with <i>yod</i> , almost always ֿ , as צַדִּיק <i>ṣaddîq</i> (righteous). b |
| | | 2. ֿ either ֿ (see below, i), as צַדִּיקִים <i>ṣaddîqîm</i> , only orthographically different from אֲדִיקִים (צַדִּיקִים),—or ֿ , as צִדְקוֹ <i>ṣîdqô</i> (his righteousness). |
| E | { | 3. ֿ <i>Serî</i> or <i>Sērê</i> with <i>yod</i> = ֿ , e.g. בֵּיתוֹ <i>bêthô</i> (his house).
ֿ either ֿ , but rarely (see below, i), or ֿ as שֵׁם <i>šēm</i> (name).
<i>Sere</i> can only be ֿ , in my opinion, in few cases, such as those mentioned in § 29 f. |
| | | 4. ֿ <i>Segôl</i> , \check{a} , a modification of ֿ , e.g. הַפְּצִי <i>hăṣṣî</i> (ground-form <i>hîṣṣ</i>); שָׁן <i>šān</i> (ground-form <i>šîn</i>). |

Third Class. U- and O-sounds.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| U | { | 1. ֿ <i>Šârēq</i> , usually ֿ , מָוֶת <i>māth</i> (to die), rarely ֿ . c |
| | | 2. ֿ <i>Qibbûs</i> , either ֿ , e.g. סֻלָּם <i>süllām</i> (ladder), or ֿ , e.g. קָמוּ <i>qūmū</i> (rise up), instead of the usual קִימוּ . |
| O | { | 3. ֿ and ֿ <i>Hôlēm</i> , ֿ and ֿ , קוֹל <i>qôl</i> (voice), רֹב <i>rôbh</i> (multitude).
Often also a defective ֿ for ֿ ; rarely ֿ for ֿ .
On the question whether ֿ under some circumstances represents ֿ , see § 93 r. |
| | | 4. ֿ On <i>Qāmēš ḥātûph</i> = ֿ , generally modified from ֿ , as חֻק <i>höq</i> (statute), see above, a. |

retained \bar{a} , \check{a} in this grammar, as being typographically simpler and not liable to any misunderstanding. For *Qāmēš ḥātûph*, in the previous German edition expressed by \check{a} , we have, after careful consideration, returned to ֿ . The use of the same sign ֿ for \bar{a} (\hat{a}) and \check{a} , shows that the Massoretes did not intend to draw a sharp distinction between them. We must not, however, regard the Jewish grammarians as making a merely idle distinction between *Qāmēš rāhāb*, or broad *Qames*, and *Qāmēš ḥātûph*, or light *Qames*. It is quite impossible that in the living language an \bar{a} lengthened from \check{a} , as in *dābār*, should have been indistinguishable from e.g. the last vowel in וַיִּשָּׁב or the first in קִדְשִׁים .—The notation \bar{a} , \check{e} , ֿ expresses here the vowels essentially long, either naturally or by contraction; the notation \bar{a} , \bar{e} , ֿ those lengthened only by the tone, and therefore changeable; \check{a} , \check{e} , ֿ the short vowels. As regards the others, the distinction into ֿ and ֿ , ֿ and ֿ is sufficient; see § 9.—The mark ֿ stands in the following pages over the tone-syllable, whenever this is not the last, as is usual, but the penultimate syllable of the word, e.g. וַיִּשָּׁב .

¹ These *Segôls*, modified from \check{a} , are very frequent in the language. The

d The names of the vowels are mostly taken from the form and action of the mouth in producing the various sounds, as פֶּתַח *opening*; צֵרִי a *wide parting* (of the mouth), also שֶׁבֶר (= *ē*) *breaking, parting* (cf. the Arab. *kasr*); הֵיָרֵק (also חֵרֵק) *narrow opening*; חֹלֶם *closing*, according to others *fullness*, i. e. of the mouth (also מִלֵּא פִּימ ¹ *fullness of the mouth*). קָמֶץ ² also denotes a *slighter*, as שֹׁרֵק and קָבוֹץ (also קָבוֹץ פִּימ) a *firmer, compression or contraction* of the mouth. סֵגוֹל (סֵגוֹל *bunch of grapes*) takes its name from its form. So שְׁלֹשׁ נִקְדוֹת (*three points*) is another name for Qibbûs.

e Moreover the names were mostly so formed (but only later), that the sound of each vowel is heard in the first syllable (קָמֶץ for קָמֶץ, פֶּתַח for פֶּתַח, צֵרִי for צֵרִי); in order to carry this out consistently some even write סֵגוֹל, Qomeš-hatûf, Qübbûs.

f 2. As the above examples show, the vowel sign stands regularly *under* the consonant, *after* which it is to be pronounced, רָ *rā*, רֶ *ră*, רֵ *rē*, רֹ *rū*, &c. The Pathah called *furtivum* (§ 22 *f*) alone forms an exception to this rule, being pronounced *before* the consonant, רוּחַ *rûah* (wind, spirit). The Hôlēm (without wāw) stands on the left above the consonant, רֹ *rō* (but לֹ = *lō*). If א, as a vowel letter, follows a consonant which is to be pronounced with *ō*, the point is placed over its right arm, thus בֹּא, ראֹשׁ; but e.g. בֹּאֵם, since א here begins a syllable.

g No dot is used for the Hôlēm when *ō* (of course without wāw) is pronounced after *sin* or before *sin*. Hence שֹׂנֵא *šônē* (hating), נִשָּׂא *nešō* (to bear), מוֹשֶׁה *môšē* (not מוֹשֶׁה); but שֹׂמֵר *šômēr* (a watchman). When *ō* precedes the *sin*, the dot is placed over its right arm, e.g. יִרְפֹּשׁ *yirpōš* (he treads with the feet), הַנֹּשְׂאִים *hannōš'im* (those who carry).

In the sign ו, the ו may also be a consonant. The ו is then either to be read *ōw* (necessarily so when a consonant otherwise without a vowel precedes, e.g. לוֹוֶה *lōwē*, lending) or *wō*, when a vowel already precedes the ו, e.g. עוֹן *‘awôn* (iniquity) for עוֹן. In more exact printing, a distinction is at least made between ו (wō) and ו (i. e. either *ō* or, when another vowel follows the wāw, *ōw*³).

Babylonian punctuation (see § 8 *g*, note 1) has only one sign for it and tone-bearing Pathah; see also Gaster, 'Die Unterschiedslosigkeit zwischen Pathach u. Segol,' in *ZAW.* 1894, p. 60 ff.

¹ On the erroneous use of the term *melô pum*, only in Germany, for *šureq* (hence also pronounced *melu pum* to indicate *û*), see E. Nestle, *ZDMG.* 1904, p. 597 ff.; Bacher, *ibid.*, p. 799 ff., *Melopum*; Simonsen, *ibid.*, p. 807 ff.

² The usual spelling קָמֶץ and פֶּתַח takes the words certainly rightly as Hebrew substantives; according to De Lagarde (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1886, p. 873, and so previously Luzzatto), קָמֶץ and פֶּתַח are rather Aram. participles, like *Dageš*, &c., and consequently to be transliterated *Qāmēs* and *Pāthah*.

³ Since 1846 we have become acquainted with a system of vocalization different in many respects from the common method. The vowel signs, all except ו, are there placed *above* the consonants, and differ almost throughout in form,

3. The vowels of the first class are, with the exception of 'ֿ in *h* the middle and ְֿ, ִֿ, ֶֿ at the end of the word (§ 9 *a-d, f*), represented *only* by vowel signs, but the long vowels of the I- and U-class largely by vowel letters. The vowel sound to which the letter

and some even as regards the sound which they denote: ֿ = *ā*, ֶֿ = tone-bearing *ā* and *ē*, ִֿ = *ē*, ֶֿ = *i*, ִֿ = *ō*, ֶֿ = *ō*, ֶֿ or ִֿ = *ū*. In an unsharpened syllable ֿ = toneless *ā* and *ē*, and also *Ḥaṭeph Pathaḥ*; ֶֿ = toneless *ē* and *Ḥaṭeph S'ghôl*; ִֿ = *ī*, ֶֿ = *ū*, ֶֿ = *ō*, and *Ḥaṭeph Qameṣ*. Lastly in toneless syllables before *Dageṣh*, ֶֿ = *ā*, ֶֿ = *ē*, ֶֿ = *i*, ֶֿ = *ū*, ֶֿ = *ā*. Š^ewa is ְֿ.

The accents differ less and stand in some cases under the line of the consonants. Besides this complicated system of the Codex Babylonicus (see below) and other MSS., there is a simpler one, used in Targums. It is still uncertain whether the latter is the foundation of the former (as Merx, *Chrest. Targ.* xi, and Bacher, *ZDMG.* 1895, p. 15 ff.), or is a later development of it among the Jews of South Arabia (as Praetorius, *ZDMG.* 1899, p. 181 ff.). For the older literature on this *Babylonian punctuation* (בְּכִלְכִּל), as it is called, see A. Harkavy and H. L. Strack, *Katalog der hebr. Bibelhandschr. der Kaiserl. öffentl. Bibliothek zu St. Petersburg.*, St. Petersburg. and Lpz., 1875, parts i and ii, p. 223 ff. A more thorough study of the system was made possible by H. Strack's facsimile edition of the *Prophetarum posteriorum codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (St. Petersburg., 1876, la. fol.) of the year 916, which Firkowitsch discovered in 1839, in the synagogue at Tschufutkale in the Crimea. The MS. has been shown by Ginsburg (*Recueil des travaux rédigés en mémoire . . . de Chwolson*, Berlin, 1899, p. 149, and *Introd.*, pp. 216 ff., 475 f.) to contain a recension of the Biblical text partly Babylonian and partly Palestinian; cf. also Barnstein, *The Targum of Onkelos to Genesis*, London, 1896, p. 6 f. Strack edited a fragment of it in *Hosea et Joel prophetæ ad fidem cod. Babylon. Petrop.*, St. Petersburg. 1875. Cf. also the publication by A. Merx, quoted above, § 7 h, and his *Chrestomathia Targumica*, Berlin, 1888; G. Margoliouth, in the *PSBA.* xv. 4, and M. Gaster, *ibid.*; P. Kahle, *Der masoret. Text des A. T. nach d. Überlief. der babyl. Juden*, Lpz. 1902, with the valuable review by Rahlfs in *GGA.* 1903, no. 5; Nestle, *ZDMG.* 1905, p. 719 (Babylonian ֶֿ = *ŷ*). According to the opinion formerly prevailing, this Babylonian punctuation exhibits the system which was developed in the Eastern schools, corresponding to and contemporaneous with the Western or Tiberian system, although a higher degree of originality, or approximation to the original of both systems of punctuation, was generally conceded to the latter. Recently, however, Wickes, *Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, Oxford, 1887, p. 142 ff., has endeavoured to show, from the accents, that the 'Babylonian' punctuation may certainly be an Oriental, but is by no means the Oriental system. It is rather to be regarded, according to him, as a later and not altogether successful attempt to modify, and thus to simplify, the system common to all the Schools in the East and West. Strack, *Wiss. Jahresb. der ZDMG.* 1879, p. 124, established the probability that the vowels of the superlinear punctuation arose under Arab influence from the vowel letters אֵי (so previously Pinsker and Graetz), while the Tiberian system shows Syrian influence.

A third, widely different system (Palestinian), probably the basis of the other two, is described by A. Neubauer, *JQR.* vii. 1895, p. 361 ff., and Friedländer, *ibid.*, p. 564 ff., and *PSBA.* 1896, p. 86 ff.; C. Levias, *Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Lit.*, xv. p. 157 ff.; and esp. P. Kahle, *Beitr. zu der Gesch. der hebr. Punctuation*, in *ZAW.* 1901, p. 273 ff. and in *Der masoret. Text des A. T.* (see above), chiefly dealing with the Berlin MS. Or. qu. 680, which contains a number of variants on the biblical text, and frequently agrees with the transcriptions of the LXX and Jerome.

points is determined more precisely by the vowel sign standing before, above, or within it. Thus—

‘ may be combined with *Hîrêq*, *Sêrê*, *Sêgôl* (‘—, ‘—, ‘—).

‘ with *Šûrêq* and *Hôlêm* (‘ and ‘).¹

In Arabic the long *a* also is regularly expressed by a vowel letter, viz. ‘*Alëph*’ (‘—), so that in that language three vowel letters correspond to the three vowel classes. In Hebrew ‘ is rarely used as a vowel letter; see § 9 b and § 23 g.

i 4. The omission of the vowel letters when writing *î*, *û*, *ê*, *ô* is called *scriptio defectiva* in contrast to *scriptio plena*. קול, קום are written *plene*, קלת, קם *defective*.

Cf. Bardowitz, *Studien zur Gesch. der Orthogr. im Althebr.*, 1894; Lidzbarski, *Ephem.*, i. 182, 275; Marmorstein, ‘*Midrasch der vollen u. defekt. Schreibung*,’ in *ZAW.* 1907, p. 33 ff.

k So far as the choice of the full or defective mode of writing is concerned, there are certainly some cases in which only the one or the other is admissible. Thus the full form is necessary at the end of the word, for *û*, *ô*, *ô*, *ê*, *ê*, *ê*, as well as for *è* in הוה &c. (§ 9 f), also generally with *a*, *â* (cf. however § 9 d), e.g. קטלי, קטלתי, קטלתי. (But the Masora requires in Jer 26⁶, 44⁸; Ezr 6²¹; 2 Ch 32¹³ גוי instead of גוי; Zp 2⁹ גוי [perhaps an error due to the following ‘] for גוי; Is 40³¹ וקוי [followed by ‘] for וקוי; Jer 38¹¹ בלוי for בלוי.) On the other hand the defective writing is common when the letter, which would have to be employed as a vowel letter, immediately precedes as a strong consonant, e.g. גוים (*nations*) for גוים, מצות (*commandments*) for מצות.

l That much is here arbitrary (see § 7 g), follows from the fact that sometimes the same word is written very differently, e.g. הקימותי Ez 16⁶⁰: הקמתי and also הקמותי Jer 23⁴; cf. § 25 b. Only it may be observed,

(a) That the *scriptio plena* in two successive syllables was generally avoided; cf. e.g. נביא but נבאים; צדיק, but צדקים; קול, קלות; יהושע; מצאהו.

(b) That in the later Books of the O. T. (and regularly in post-biblical Hebrew) the full form, in the earlier the defective, is more usual.

m 5. In the cognate dialects, when a vowel precedes a vowel-letter which is not kindred (heterogeneous), e.g. ו—, ו—, ו—, ו—, ו—, a diphthong (*au*, *ai*)² is formed if the heterogeneous vowel be *a*. This is also to be regarded as the Old Hebrew pronunciation, since it

¹ After the example of the Jewish grammarians the expression, ‘the vowel letter rests (*quiesces*) in the vowel-sign,’ has become customary. On the other hand, the vowel letters are also called by the grammarians, *matres lectionis* or *supports* (*fulcrâ*).

² Cf. T. C. Foote, *The diphthong ai in Hebrew* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars, June, 1903, p. 70 ff.).

agrees with the vocalic character of ו and י (§ 5 b, note 2). Thus such words as וַי, וַי, וַי, וַי, וַי, וַי are not to be pronounced according to the usual Jewish custom¹ as *vāv*, *hay*, *gōy*, *'āsūy*, *gēv*, *bayith* (or even as *vaf*, &c.; cf. modern Greek *av af*, *ev ef* for *aṽ*, *ε´*), but with the Italian Jews more like *wāu*, *hai*, &c. The sound of וַי is the same as וַי, i.e. almost like *āu*, so that וַי is often written defectively for וַי.

§ 9. Character of the several Vowels.

Numerous as are the vowel signs in Hebrew writing, they are yet *a* not fully adequate to express all the various modifications of the vowel sounds, especially with respect to length and shortness. To understand this better a short explanation of the character and value of the several vowels is required, especially in regard to their length and shortness as well as to their changeableness (§§ 25, 27).

I. First Class. A-sound.

1. *Qameṣ* (וַי), when it represents a long *a*, is, by nature and origin, of two kinds:—

(1) The essentially long *ā* (in Arabic regularly written *ā*), which is not readily shortened and never wholly dropped (§ 25 c), e.g. *קָתַבְתִּי* *keṯābh* (writing); very seldom with a following *ā*, as *שָׁמַרְתָּ* 2 S 12^{1,4} (see the examples in § 72 p).²

The writing of *חָסַדְךָ* Ho 10¹⁴ for *חָסַדְךָ* would only be justifiable, if the *ā* *b* of this form were to be explained as a contraction of *āā*; cf. however § 72 a; *דָּגַתְךָ* Neh 13¹⁶ for *דָּגַתְךָ* (*dāg*) is certainly incorrect.—The rarity of the *ā* in Hebrew arises from the fact that it has for the most part become an obtuse *ō*; see below, *q*.

(2) *ā*, lengthened only by position (i.e. tone-long or at all events *c* lengthened under the influence of the tone, according to the laws for the formation of syllables, § 27 e-h), either in the tone-syllable itself (or in the secondary tone-syllable indicated by *Mèthēg*, see below), or just before or after it. This sound is invariably lengthened from an original *ā*,³ and is found in open syllables, i.e. syllables ending in a vowel (§ 26 b), e.g. *לָקַחְתָּ*, *לָקַחְתָּ*, *לָקַחְתָּ* (Arab. *lākā*, *qātālā*, *yāqūmū*, *'āsīrū*), as well as in closed syllables, i.e. those ending in

¹ In MSS. ו and י, in such combinations as וַי, וַי, are even marked with Mappiq (§ 14 a).

² Of a different kind are the cases in which *ā* has lost its consonantal sound by coalescing with a preceding *a*, § 23 a-d.

³ In Arabic this *ā* is always retained in an open syllable.

a consonant, as כָּוֶכֶב (vulgar Arab. *yād, kaukāb*). In a closed syllable, however, it can only stand when this has the tone, עוֹלָם, דְּבָר; whereas in an open syllable it is especially frequent *before* the tone, e.g. דְּבָר, זָמַן, לֵבָם. Where the tone is moved forward or weakened (as happens most commonly in what is called the construct state of nouns, cf. § 89 a) the original short *ā* (*Pathah*) is retained in a closed syllable, while in an open syllable it becomes *Šewā* (§ 27 i): חָכַם, constr. state חִכָּם (*hākhām*); דְּבָר, constr. דְּבַר (*dēbhār*); קָטַל, constr. קִטַּל. For examples of the retention, in the secondary tone-syllable, of *ā* lengthened from *ā*, see § 93 *xx*.

d In some terminations of the verb (הָ in the 2nd sing. masc. perf., יָ in the 2nd pl. fem. of the imperat., as well as in the 3rd and 2nd pl. fem. of the imperf.), in תָּחֹל (masc.) and in the suffixes הָ and הָ, the final *ā* can stand even without a vowel letter. A הָ is, however, in these cases (except with הָ) frequently added as a vowel letter.

On — for *ō* see below, *f*.

e 2. *Pathah*, or short *ā*, stands in Hebrew almost exclusively in a closed syllable with or without the tone (קָטַל, קָטַלְתָּ). In places where it now appears to stand in an open syllable the syllable was originally closed, and a helping vowel (*ā*, *i*) has been inserted after the second radical merely to make the pronunciation easier, e.g. נָחַל (ground-form *naḥl*), בַּיִת (Arab. *bait*), see § 28 d, and with regard to two cases of a different kind, § 26 g, h. Otherwise *ā* in an open syllable has almost without exception passed into *ā* (—), see above, c.

On the very frequent attenuation of *ā* to *i*, cf. below, h. On the rare, and only apparent union of *Pathah* with ■ (אָ—), see § 23 d, end. On *ā* as a helping-vowel, § 22 f (*Pathah furtivum*), and § 28 e.

f 3. *Segôl* (ē, ē [*ā*]) by origin belongs sometimes to the second, but most frequently to the first vowel class (§ 27 o, p, u). It belongs to the first class when it is a modification of *a* (as the Germ. *Bad*, pl. *Büder*; Eng. *man*, pl. *men*), either in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָדָכֶם (for *yadkhēm*), or with the tone, e.g. אָרָץ from 'arṣ, קָרְן Arab. *qārṇ*, קָמַח Arab. *qāmḥ*. This *Segôl* is often retained even in the strongest tone-syllable, at the end of a sentence or of an important clause (in *pause*), as מַלְאֲכָה, צָרָק (mālākh, sāḏāq). As a rule, however, in such cases the *Pathah* which underlies the *Segôl* is lengthened into *Qameṣ*, e.g. קָרְן, קָמַח. A *Segôl* apparently lengthened from *Šewā*, but in reality traceable to an original *ā*, stands in pausal forms, as פָּרִי (ground-form *pāry*), יָהִי (yāhy), &c. On the cases where a ' (originally consonantal) follows this *Segôl*, see § 75 f, and § 91 k.

II. Second Class. I- and E-sounds.

4. The long *i* is frequently even in the consonantal writing indicated *g* by ' (a *fully* written *Hireq* '—); but a naturally long *i* can be also written *defectively* (§ 8 *i*), e. g. צְדִיק (righteous), plur. צְדִיקִים *saddîqîm*; יִירָא (he fears), plur. יִירָאוּ. Whether a *defectively* written *Hireq* is long may be best known from the origin of the form; often also from the nature of the syllable (§ 26), or as in יִירָאוּ from the *Metheg* attached to it (§ 16 *f*).

5. The short *Hireq* (always¹ written *defectively*) is especially frequent *h* in sharpened syllables (קָפַץ, אָפַץ) and in toneless closed syllables (מְנוּחָה *psalm*); cf. however וַיִּשָּׁב in a closed tone-syllable, and even וַיִּפֶּן, with a helping *Segôl*, for *wayyîphn*. It has arisen very frequently by attenuation from *ā*, as in דְּבַרִּי from original *dābārê*, צָרָקִי (ground-form *sādq*),² or else it is the original *ĭ*, which in the tone-syllable had become *ē*, as in אֹיְבֶךָ (thy enemy) from אֵיִב (ground-form 'āyĭb).³ It is sometimes a simple helping vowel, as in בֵּית, § 28 *e*.

The earlier grammarians call every *Hireq* written *fully*, *Hireq magnum*; every one written *defectively*, *Hireq parvum*,—a misleading distinction, so far as quantity is concerned.

6. The longest *ê* '— (more rarely defective —, e. g. עֵנִי for עֵינִי *i* Is 3⁸; at the end of a word also הֵ—) is as a rule contracted from '— *ay* (*ai*), § 7 *a*, e. g. הַיְכָל (palace), Arab. and Syriac *haikal*.

7. The *Sere* without *Yôdh* mostly represents the tone-long *ē*, which, *h* like the tone-long *ā* (see *c*), is very rarely retained except *in* and *before* the tone-syllable, and is always lengthened from an original *ĭ*. It stands in an open syllable with or before the tone, e. g. סֵפֶר (ground-form *sîphr*) *book*, שָׁנָה (Arab. *šināt*) *sleep*, or with *Metheg* (see § 16 *d, f*) in the secondary tone-syllable, e. g. מִשְׁאֲלֹתִי *my request*, נִלְכְּהָ *let us go*. On the other hand in a closed syllable it is almost always with the tone, as בֶּן *son*, נֶפֶס *dumb*.

Exceptions: (*a*) *ē* is sometimes retained in a toneless closed syllable, in *l* monosyllabic words before *Maqqeph*, e. g. עֵינֶךָ Nu 35¹⁸, as well as in the examples of *nāsôg* 'āhôr mentioned in § 29 *f* (on the quantity cf. § 8 *b 3* end); (*b*) in a toneless open final syllable, *Sere* likewise occurs in examples of the *nāsôg* 'āhôr, as מִצָּן Ex 16²⁹; cf. Ju 9³⁹.

8. The *Segôl* of the I(E)-class is most frequently an *ē* modified from *m* original *ĭ*, either replacing a tone-long *ē* which has lost the tone, e. g.

¹ At least according to the Masoretic orthography; cf. Wellhausen, *Text der Bb. Sam.*, p. 18, Rem.

² Jerome (cf. Siegfried, *ZAW.* 1884, p. 77) in these cases often gives *ā* for *ĭ*.

³ Cf. the remarks of I. Guidi, 'La pronuncia del sêrê,' in the *Verhandl. des Hamburger Orient.-Kongr.* of 1902, Leiden, 1904, p. 208 ff., on Italian *e* for Latin *i*, as in *fede* = *fidem*, *pece* = *picem*.

מן from מֵן (*give*), יִצְרָךְ (*thy creator*) from יָצַר, or in the case discussed in § 93 *a*, חִלְקִי, עֲזָרִי from the ground-forms *hilq*, *izr*; cf. also § 64 *f*. *Seḡôl* appears as a simple helping-vowel in cases such as סִפְרָה for *siphr*, יִגְלִי for *yigl* (§ 28 *e*).

III. Third Class. U- and O-sounds.

n 9. For the U-sound there is—

(1) the long *û*, either (*a*) written fully, שׁוּרֵק, e.g. גְּבוּל (*boundary*), or (*b*) defectively written — Qibbûs, יִמְתֵּן, גְּבֻלָּה;

(2) the short *û*, mostly represented by Qibbûs, in a toneless closed syllable and especially common in a sharpened syllable, in e.g. שֻׁלְחָן (*table*), סֻבָּה (*booth*).

O Sometimes also *û* in a sharpened syllable is written ו, e.g. הַבָּהָה ψ 102⁵, יוֹגֵד Jb 5⁷, בּוֹלֵם Jer. 31³⁴, מְשׁוֹבְתוֹ Is 5⁵, עֲרוֹמִים Gn 22²⁵ for הַבָּהָה, &c.

For this *u* the LXX write ο, e.g. עֲרִיִם 'Οδολλάμ, from which, however, it only follows, that this *û* was pronounced somewhat indistinctly. The LXX also express the sharp *Hîreq* by ε, e.g. אֶמֶר = Ἐμμήρ. The pronunciation of the Qibbûs like the German *û*, which was formerly common, is incorrect, although the occasional pronunciation of the U-sounds as *û* in the time of the punctators is attested, at least as regards Palestine¹; cf. the Turkish *bûlbûl* for the Persian *bulbul*, and the pronunciation of the Arabic *dunyâ* in Syria as *dûnyâ*.

p 10. The O-sound bears the same relation to U as the E does to I in the second class. It has four varieties:—

(1) The *ô* which is contracted from *aw* (= *au*), § 7 *a*, and accordingly is mostly written fully; שׁוֹט (*a whip*), Arab. *saut*, עוֹלָה (*iniquity*) from עוֹלָה. More rarely defectively, as שְׂרָךְ (*thine ox*) from שׁוֹר Arab. *šaur*.

q (2) The long *ô* which arose in Hebrew at an early period, by a general process of obscuring, out of an original *â*,² while the latter has been retained in Arabic and Aramaic. It is usually written *fully* in the tone-syllable, *defectively* in the toneless, e.g. קָטַל Arab. *qâtîl*. Aram. *qâtêl*, אֵלָה Arab. *ʾilâh*, Aram. *ʾlâh*, plur. אֵלֵהִים שׁוֹק (*leg*), Arab. *sâq*; גִּבּוֹר (*hero*), Arab. *gābbār*; חוֹתָם (*seal*), Arab. *hātām*; רִמּוֹן (*pomegranate*), Arab. *rūmmān*; שְׁלִטָּה (*dominion*), Aram. *šlîṭān* and שְׁלִטָּה Arab. *sūlṭān*; שְׁלוֹם (*peace*), Aram. *šlām*, Arab. *sālām*. Sometimes the form in *â* also occurs side by side with that in *ô* as שְׂרִיָּה and שְׂרִיִּין (*coat of mail*; see however § 29 *u*). Cf. also § 68 *b*.

r (3) The tone-long *ō* which is lengthened from an original *û*, or from an *ô* arising from *û*, by the tone, or in general according to the

¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Physiologie u. Musik*, Lpz. 1868, p. 15 *f*.

² Cf. above, *b*, end. On Jerome's transliteration of *o* for *â*, see ZAW. 1884, p. 75.

laws for the formation of syllables. It occurs not only in the tone-syllable, but also in an open syllable before the tone, e.g. קִרְשׁ (ground-form *qūḏš*) *sanctuary*; בִּרְךָ for *burrah*, יִלְקֻמוּ ψ 104²⁸, as well as (with *Metheg*) in the secondary tone-syllable; אֶחָד, אֶחָד. But the original *ō* (*ū*) is retained in a toneless closed syllable, whereas in a toneless open syllable it is weakened to *Šwā*. Cf. כָּל *all*, but כָּל־ (*kōl*), כָּלָם (*kūllām*); יִקְטֹל, יִקְטֹלְךָ and יִקְטְלוּ, where original *ū* is weakened to *Šwā*: יִקְטְלוּ, Arab. *yaqtūlū*. This tone-long *ō* is only as an exception written fully.

(4) $\overline{\text{—}}$ *Qameš-ḥaṭuph* represents *ō* (properly *ǎ*, cf. § 8 a, note 2) modified *s* from *ū* and is therefore classed here. It stands in the same relation to *Holem* as the *Segōl* of the second class to *Sere*, כָּל *kōl*, וַיַּיָּאֻמּוּ *wayyāqōm*. On the distinction between this and *Qameš*, see below, *u*.

11. The following table gives a summary of the gradation of the *t* three vowel-classes according to the quantity of the vowels:—

First Class : A.	Second Class : I and E.	Third Class : U and O.
$\overline{\text{—}}$ original <i>ā</i> (Arabic أَ).	$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>ē</i> , from original <i>ay</i> (<i>ai</i>).	$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>ō</i> , from original <i>aw</i> (<i>au</i>).
	$\overline{\text{—}}$ or — long <i>i</i> .	$\overline{\text{—}}$ or — <i>ō</i> obscured from <i>ā</i> .
		$\overline{\text{—}}$ or — <i>ū</i> .
$\overline{\text{—}}$ tone-long <i>ā</i> (from original <i>ā</i>) chiefly in the tone-syllable but also just before it.	$\overline{\text{—}}$ tone-long <i>ē</i> (from <i>i</i>) generally in the tone-syllable but also just before it.	— tone-long <i>ō</i> (from original <i>ū</i>) in the tone-syllable, otherwise in an open syllable.
$\overline{\text{—}}$ (as a modification of <i>ā</i>) sometimes a tone-long <i>ē</i> , sometimes <i>ě</i> .	$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>ě</i> .	$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>Ǔ</i> , modified from <i>ū</i> .
— short <i>ā</i> .	— short <i>i</i> .	— short <i>ū</i> , especially in a sharpened syllable.
[$\overline{\text{—}}$ <i>i</i> attenuated from <i>ā</i> ; see <i>h</i> .] Utmost weakening to $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^a , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^ě , — ^e .	Utmost weakening to $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^a , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^ě , or — ^e .	Utmost weakening to $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^a , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^Ǔ , $\overline{\text{—}}$ ^o , or — ^e .

Rem. On the distinction between *Qameš* and *Qameš-ḥaṭuph*.¹

According to § 8 a, long *ā* or *ā̃* (*Qameš*) and short *ō* or *Ǔ* (*Qameš-ḥaṭuph*) are in manuscripts and printed texts generally expressed by the same sign ($\overline{\text{—}}$), e.g. קָם *qām*, כָּל *kōl*. The beginner who does not yet know the grammatical

¹ These statements, in order to be fully understood, must be studied in connexion with the theory of syllables (§ 26) and *Metheg* (§ 16 c-i).

origin of the words in question (which is of course the surest guide), may depend meanwhile on the following principal rules:—

1. The sign ֿ ¹ is \ddot{o} in a toneless closed syllable, since such a syllable can have only a short vowel (§ 26 o). The above case occurs—

(a) When *Šewā* follows as a syllable-divider, as in חֹכְמָה *hōkh-mā* (wisdom), אֹכֶלֶת *ōkh-lā* (food). With *Metheg* ֿ is \bar{a} ($\bar{ā}$) and according to the usual view stands in an open syllable with a following *Šewā* mobile, e.g. אָכַלָה *ā-khēlā* (she ate); but cf. § 16 i.

(b) When a closed syllable is formed by *Dageš forte*, e.g. חַנּוּנֵנִי *hōnnēnī* (have mercy upon me); but בְּרַחֲמִים (with *Metheg*, § 16 f ζ) *bāttīm*.

(c) When the syllable in question loses the tone on account of a following *Maqqēph* (§ 16 a), e.g. כָּל־הָאָדָם *kōl-hā-ādām* (all men).

In ψ 35¹⁰ and Pr 19⁷ *Maqqēph* with כָּל is replaced by a conjunctive accent (*Mer^ekha*); so by *Darga*, Ju 19⁶ with סָעַר , and Ez 37⁸ with וַיִּקְרָם (so Baer after Qimhi; ed. Mant., Ginsburg, Kittel וַיִּקְרָם).

(d) In a closed final syllable without the tone, e.g. וַיָּקָם *wayyāqōm* (and he stood up).—In the cases where \acute{a} or \bar{a} in the final syllable has become toneless through *Maqqēph* (§ 16 a) and yet remains, e.g. בְּחַבְיֵהֶם Est 4⁸, שֶׁת־לִי Gn 4²⁵, it has a *Metheg* in correct manuscripts and printed texts.

In cases like לָמָּה, הֲלָאָה *lāmmā*, the tone shows that ֿ is to be read as \bar{a} .

2. The cases in which ֿ appears to stand in an open syllable and yet is to be read as \ddot{o} require special consideration. This is the case, (a) when *Ḥateph-Qameš* follows, e.g. פָּעַל *his work*, or simple vocal *Šewā*, e.g. גֹּאֵד *ox goad*; Jo 4⁷; נִשְׁמְרָה (so ed. Mant., Ginsb.) *preserve* ψ 86², cf. 16¹ and the cases mentioned in § 48 i, note, and § 61 f; other examples are Ob 11, Ju 14¹⁵; *Ḥateph-Pathah* follows in לְמִשְׁחָה (so Ginsburg; Baer לְמִשְׁחָה) I S 15¹, לְהַגִּיד 24¹¹, and יִפְנֶשֶׁךָ (so Baer, Gn 32¹⁸, others יִפְנֶשֶׁךָ); (b) before another *Qameš-ḥatuph*, e.g. פָּעַלְךָ *thy work*; on אֶרְהֶלִי and קְבַה־לִי Nu 23⁷, see § 67 o; (c) in the two plural forms קִדְשִׁים *sanctuaries* and שִׁרְשִׁים *roots* (also written קִרְ and שִׁרְ). In all these cases the Jewish grammarians regard the *Metheg* accompanying the ֿ as indicating a *Qameš raḥabh* (broad *Qameš*) and therefore read the ֿ as \bar{a} ; thus *pā-^olō*, *dā-re^bān*, *pā-šē^ekhā*, *qā-dāšīm*. But neither the origin of these forms, nor the analogous formations in Hebrew and in the cognate languages, nor the transcription of proper names in the

¹ In the Babylonian punctuation (§ 8 g, note) \bar{a} and \ddot{o} are carefully distinguished. So also in many MSS. with the ordinary punctuation and in Baer's editions of the text since 1880, in which ֿ is used for \ddot{o} as well as for \bar{a} . Cf. Baer-Delitzsch, *Liber Jobi*, p. 43. But the identity of the two signs is certainly original, and the use of ֿ for \ddot{o} is misleading.

LXX, allows us to regard this view as correct. It is just possible that Qames is here used loosely for \tilde{a} , as the equivalent of \bar{a} , on the analogy of קָמֶץ &c., § 93 *q*. As a matter of fact, however, we ought no doubt to divide and read $p\bar{o}'\bar{l}\bar{o}$ (for $p\bar{o}'\bar{l}\bar{o}$), $p\bar{o}'\bar{o}'\bar{l}\bar{k}h\bar{a}$, $q\bar{o}d\bar{a}'\bar{s}i\bar{m}$.—Quite as inconceivable is it for *Meleg* to be a sign of the lengthening into \bar{a} in בְּחִירָא (Ex 11⁸), although it is so in בְּאִנִּי $b\bar{a}\text{-}^{\circ}n\bar{i}$ (in the navy), since here the \bar{a} of the article appears under the ב .

§ 10. *The Half Vowels and the Syllable Divider (Šewâ).*

1. Besides the full vowels, Hebrew has also a series of vowel *a* sounds which may be called *half vowels* (Sievers, *Murmelvokale*). The punctuation makes use of these to represent extremely slight sounds which are to be regarded as remains of fuller and more distinct vowels from an earlier period of the language. They generally take the place of vowels *originally short* standing in *open syllables*. Such short vowels, though preserved in the kindred languages, are not tolerated by the present system of pointing in Hebrew, but either undergo a lengthening or are weakened to Šewâ. Under some circumstances, however, the original short vowel may reappear.

To these belongs first of all the sign $\frac{e}{-}$, which indicates an extremely short, slight, and (as regards pronunciation) indeterminate vowel sound, something like an obscure half \check{e} ($\frac{e}{-}$). It is called $\check{S}ew\acute{a}$,¹ which may be either *simple* $\check{S}ew\acute{a}$ ($\check{S}ew\acute{a}$ *simplex*) as distinguished from the compound (see *f*), or *vocal* $\check{S}ew\acute{a}$ ($\check{S}ew\acute{a}$ *mobile*) as distinguished from $\check{S}ew\acute{a}$ *quiescens*, which is silent and stands as a mere syllable divider (see *i*) under the consonant which closes the syllable.

The vocal *Ṣe'ud* stands under a consonant which is closely united, as *C* a kind of grace-note, with the following syllable, either (a) at the beginning of the word, as קטל *q^etāl* (to kill), מלא *m^emallē* (filling), or (b) in the middle of the word, as קטלה *qō-tēlā*, יקטל *yiq-tēlū*.

In former editions of this Grammar Ševā was distinguished as *medium* *d* when it followed a short vowel and therefore stood in a supposed 'loosely closed' or 'wavering' syllable, as in מְלִיכָה, בְּנִימָלִי. According to Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 22, this distinction must now be abandoned. These syllables are really closed, and the original vowel is not merely shortened, but entirely elided. The fact that a following B'gadk'phath letter (§ 6 n) remains spirant instead of taking *Dageš lene*, is explained by Sievers on the 'supposition that the change from hard to spirant is older than the elision

¹ On שָׁוָא, the older and certainly the only correct form (as in Ben Asher), see Bacher, *ZDMG.* 1895, p. 18, note 3, who compares Šewayya, the name of the Syriac accentual sign of similar form ܥܝܝܐ (= Hebr. Zaqeph). The form שְׁוָא, customary in Spain since the time of Menaḥem b. Sarūq, is due to a supposed connexion with Aram. נִשְׁבַּת *rest*, and hence would originally have denoted only *Šewā quiescens*, like the Arabic *sukūn* (rest). The derivation from נִשְׁבַּת, נִשְׁבֵּה (stem נִשְׁבַּ, *Levias, American Journ. of Philol.*, xvi. 28 ff.) seems impossible.

of the vowel, and that the prehistoric *malakai* became *malakhai* before being shortened to *malkeh*. In cases like בָּקָא (from בָּקָא), יָקָח (from יָקָח) the dropping of the *Dageš forte* shows that the original vowel is completely lost.

c The sound *ē* has been adopted as the normal transcription of simple *Šewā mobile*, although it is certain that it often became assimilated in sound to other vowels. The LXX express it by *ε*, or even by *η*, כְּרוֹבִים Χερουβίμ, הַלְלִי-יְהוָה ἁλληλουία, more frequently by *α*, שְׁמוֹנֶה שָׁמוֹנֶה, but very frequently by assimilating its indeterminate sound to the following principal vowel, e.g. כְּרוֹבִים Σόδομα, שְׁלֹמֹה Σολομών (as well as Σαλωμών), צְבָאוֹת Σαβαώθ, נַחֲנָה Ναθανάη.¹ A similar account of the pronunciation of *Šewā* is given by Jewish grammarians of the middle ages.²

How the *Šewā* sound has arisen through the vanishing of a full vowel is seen, e.g. in בָּרַךְ from *bārākā*, as the word is still pronounced in Arabic. In that language the full short vowel regularly corresponds to the Hebrew *Šewā mobile*.

f 2. Connected with the simple *Šewā mobile* is the compound *Šewā* or *Ḥāṭēph (corruptum)*, i.e. a *Šewā* the pronunciation of which is more accurately fixed by the addition of a short vowel. There are three *Šewā*-sounds determined in this way, corresponding to the three vowel classes (§ 7 a):—

(—) *Ḥāṭēph-Páthāh*, e.g. חָמוֹר *hāmôr*, ass.

(—) *Ḥāṭēph-Segól*, e.g. אָמַר *‘emôr*, to say.

(—) *Ḥāṭēph-Qāmēṣ*, e.g. חָלִי *h’lî*, sickness.

These *Ḥāṭēphs*, or at least the first two, stand especially under the four guttural letters (§ 22 l), instead of a simple *Šewā mobile*, since these letters by their nature require a more definite vowel than the indeterminate simple *Šewā mobile*. Accordingly a guttural at the beginning of a syllable, where the *Šewā* is necessarily vocal, can never have a mere *Šewā simplex*.

On — the shorter *Ḥāṭēf* as compared with — cf. § 27 v.

g Rem. A. Only — and — occur under letters which are not gutturals. *Ḥāṭēph-Pathāh* is found instead of simple *Šewā* (especially *Šewā mobile*), chiefly (a) under strengthened consonants, since this strengthening (commonly called doubling) causes a more distinct pronunciation of the *Šewā mobile*, שְׁבַל branches, Zc 4¹². According to the rule given by Ben-Asher (which, however, appears to be unknown to good early MSS. and is therefore rejected by Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 466; cf. Foote, *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars*, June 1903,

¹ The same occurs frequently also in the Greek and Latin transcriptions of Phoenician words, e.g. מָלָכָא *Malaga*, גְּבוּלִים *gubulim* (Schröder, *Die phöniz. Spr.*, p. 139 ff.). Cf. the Latin augment in *momordā*, *pupugi*, with the Greek in τέτυφα, τετυμμένος, and the old form *memordā*.

² See especially *Yehuda Hayyūg*, pp. 4 f. and 130 f. in Nutt's edition (Lond. 1870), corresponding to p. 200 of the edition by Dukes (Stuttg. 1844); Ibn Ezra's *Šaḥoth*, p. 3; Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache*, p. 68. The *Manuel du lecteur*, mentioned above, § 6 b, also contains express rules for the various ways of pronouncing *Šewā mobile*: so too the *Dikduke ha-t’amim*, ed. by Baer and Strack, Lpz. 1879, p. 12 ff. Cf. also Schreiner, *ZAW.* vi. 236 ff.

p. 71 f.), the *Ḥateph* is necessary¹ when, in a strengthened medial consonant with *Šewā* (consequently not in cases like וְיָהִי, &c.), preceded by a Pathah, the sign of the strengthening (*Dageš forte*) has fallen away, e. g. הָלָלוּ (but ed. Mant. and Ginsb. הִלְלוּ) *praise ye!* וְיִתְאַצְּחוּ Ju 16¹⁶; no less universally, where after a consonant with *Šewā* the same consonant follows (to separate them more sharply, and hence with a *metheg* always preceding), e. g. סוֹדֵרִים ψ 68⁷; קָלְלָתְךָ (ed. Mant. and Ginsb. קָלַלְ) Gn 27¹³ (but not without exceptions, e. g. הִקְקִי Ju 5¹⁵, Is 10¹; צָלְלִי Jer 6⁵, and so always הִנְנִי *behold me*, הִנְנוּ *behold us*; on כִּי before the suffix יך, see § 20 b); also in certain forms under *Kaph* and *Rēš* after a long vowel and before the tone, e. g. תִּאֲכַלְנָה Gn 3¹⁷; בָּרַכְּךָ ψ 103¹; וְיִשְׁרְתָהּ 1 K 1⁴ (but וְיִתְבָּרְכוּ ψ 72¹⁷, cf. Jer 4², 1 Ch 29²⁰, because the tone is thrown back on to the *ā*. After *ē* *Šewā* remains even before the tone, as בָּרַכּוּ, &c.; but before Maqqef אֲלֹכֵהֶנָּא Baer Ex 4¹⁸, 2 S 15⁷, Jer 40¹⁵, but ed. Mant., Jabl., Ginsb. אֱלִי²); (b) under initial sibilants after *ā* copulative, e. g. וְיָהֵב Gn 2¹²; cf. Jer 48²⁰; וְכַחַר Is 45¹⁴; וְיִשְׂרָהּ Lv 25³⁴; וְשָׁקָה Gn 27²⁶; וְיִשְׁמַע Nu 23¹⁸, Is 37¹⁷, Dn 9¹⁸, cf. Ju 5¹², 1 K 14²¹, 2 K 9¹⁷, Jb 14¹, Ec 9⁷—to emphasize the vocal character of the *Šewā*. For the same reason under the emphatic ט in הוֹטֵלוּ Jer 22²⁸; cf. Jb 33²³; after *Qôph* in וְקִדְרָתִי (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Jabl., Ginsb. וְקִי) Ez 23⁴¹; וְגִרְבִּי ψ 55²²; cf. Jer. 32⁹; under *Rēš* in אֲרָרָה (ed. Mant. אֲרִי) Gn 18²¹; וְיָרַעַם ψ 28⁹; even under ת Ezr 26²¹; under ב Est 2⁸; וְיִבְרַכְךָ so Jabl., Ginsb., but ed. Mant. וְיִבְרֵךְ Dt 24¹³; (c) under sonants, sibilants or *Qôph* after *ā*, e. g. יִצְחָק Gn 21⁶, cf. 30³⁸ and Ez 21²⁸ (under ק) אֲמֹרוֹת ψ 12⁷; הִתְמַלֵּךְ Jer 22¹⁵; בְּנֵרוֹת Jos 11²; בִּסְבָּקָה ψ 74⁵,—for the same reason as the cases under *b*³; according to Baer also in שְׂפֹמוֹת 1 S 30²⁸; וְיִפְגֹּשֶׁךְ Gn 32¹⁸ after *ō* (cf. § 9 v), as well as after *a* in הִקְשִׁיבָה Dn 9¹⁹; הִבְרַכָּה Gn 27³⁸; הִמְצַרְעִים 2 K 7⁸.

B. The *Ḥateph-Qames* is less restricted to the gutturals than the first two, *h* and stands more frequently for a simple *Šewā mobile* when an original O-sound requires to be partly preserved, e. g. at the beginning, in רָאִי (ground-form *rō'y*) *vision* (cf. § 93 z); בְּנִינֵיהּ 2 Ch 31¹², &c., *Q'rê* (*Keth.* "כּוֹנִי"); עֲמוֹנִיֹת *Ammonitish women*, 1 K 11¹ (sing. עֲמוֹנִית); יִרְדְּבָךְ for the usual יִרְדְּבֶךָ Ez 35⁶, from יִרְדֵּף תִּקְבְּנִי Nu 23²⁵, Jer 31³⁸, and elsewhere before suffixes, cf. § 60 a; קִדְקְרוֹ *his pate* (from קִדְקֵר) ψ 7¹⁷, &c.; אֲשַׁקֵּטָה Is 18⁴ *Q'rê*. Further, like *—*, it stands under consonants, which ought to have *Dageš forte*, as in לִקְחָהּ (for לָקְחָהּ) Gn 2²³. In this example, as in וְסַעְרָהּ 1 K 13⁷; וְסִפָּאָה 2 K 7¹⁸; and וְצַעֲקִי Jer 22²⁰, the *Ḥateph-Qames* is no doubt due to the influence of the

¹ See Delitzsch, 'Bemerkungen über masoretisch treue Darstellung des ältesten Textes,' in the *Ztschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, vol. xxiv. 1863, p. 409 ff.

² On the uncertainty of the MSS. in some cases which come under *a*, see *Minhat shay* (the Masoretic comm. in ed. Mant.) on Gn 12³ and Ju 7⁶.

³ Ben-Asher requires *—* for *—* (even for *Šewā quiescens*) generally before a guttural or ר; hence Baer reads in 2 S 15⁵ בְּקִרְבִּי, ψ 18⁷ אֲקִרָא; 49¹⁵ לִשְׂאוֹל; 65⁵ תִּבְחָר; 68²⁴ תִּמְחֵךְ; Pr 3c¹⁷ תִּלְעַג; Jb 29²⁵ אֲבַחֵךְ; cf. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 12⁷, note.

following guttural as well as of the preceding U-sound. (Elsewhere indeed after ך in similar cases *Hiataph-Pathah* is preferred, see above, b ; but with לָקַחַהּ cf. also סָבְלוּ Is 9³, 1c²⁵, 14²⁵, where the U-sound must necessarily be admitted to have an influence on the $\check{S}ewá$ immediately following.) In וְיִטְהַרֵּם ($\acute{u}-\text{í}^{\text{h}}\text{h}ór$) Jb 17⁹ it is also influenced by the following O-sound. In קִסְמִי 1 S 28⁸ $\text{Q}^{\text{e}}rē$, the original form is קָסַם , where again the \bar{o} represents an \bar{o} . It is only through the influence of a following guttural that we can explain the forms נִקְרָאָה Est 2¹⁴; נִבְהָל Pr 28²²; נִסְרַחָה Jer 49⁷; אֶפְשָׁעָה Is 27⁴; וְאִשְׁעָה Dn 8¹³; שָׁמְעָה ψ 39¹³; בִּסְעָרָה 2 K 2¹ (Baer's ed. also in ver. 11); הִקְהִיתִים 2 Ch 34¹² (ed. Mant., Opatius, &c. הִקְ). Finally in most of the examples which have been adduced, the influence of an emphatic sound (פ , ט , cf. also אֶלְקִסְטָה Ru 2^{8.7}), or of a sibilant is also to be taken into account.

i 3. The sign of the *simple* $\check{S}ewá$ — serves also as a mere syllable divider. In this case it is disregarded in pronunciation and is called $\check{S}ewá$ *quiescens*. In the middle of a word it stands under every consonant which closes a syllable; at the end of words on the other hand it is omitted except in *final* ך (to distinguish it better from final י), e.g. מֶלֶךְ *king*, and in the less frequent case, where a word ends with a mute after another vowelless consonant as in נָרַךְ *nard*, אָתָּה *thou fem.* (for 'ant), קָטַלְתָּ *thou fem. hast killed*, וַיִּשֶׁק *and he watered*, וַיִּשָּׁב *and he took captive*, אַל־תִּשָּׂא *drink thou not*; but וַיִּרְא , חָטָא .¹

k. However, in the examples where a mute closes the syllable, the final $\check{S}ewá$ comes somewhat nearer to a vocal $\check{S}ewá$, especially as in almost all the cases a weakening of a final vowel has taken place, viz. אָתָּה 'att^e from אָתָּי 'attⁱ ('anti), קָטַלְתָּ from קָטַלְתִּי (cf. in this form, the 2nd sing. fem. perf. Qal, even בָּאתָ , after a vowel, Gn 16⁸, Mi 4¹⁰, &c., according to the readings of Baer), יִשָּׁב yišb^e from יִשְׁבָּה , &c. The Arabic actually has a short vowel in analogous forms. In נָרַךְ borrowed from the Indian, as also in קִשְׁט ($qōšṭ$) Pr 22²¹; and in אַל־תּוֹסֵף *ne addas* (for which we should expect תּוֹסֵף) Pr 30⁶ the final mute of itself attracts a slight vowel sound.

l Rem. The proper distinction between *simple* $\check{S}ewá$ *mobile* and *quiescens* depends on a correct understanding of the formation of syllables (§ 26). The beginner may observe for the present, that (1) $\check{S}ewá$ is always *mobile* (a) at the beginning of a word (except in שָׂתִי , שָׂתִים § 97 b , note); (b) under a consonant with *Dageš forte*, e.g. גִּיד־דִּפְחִי *gid-d'phū*; (c) after another $\check{S}ewá$, e.g. יִקְטֹלֶנִי *yiqṭelēnī* (except at the end of the word, see above, i). (2) $\check{S}ewá$ is *quiescens* (a) at the end of a word, even in the ך ; (b) before another $\check{S}ewá$.

§ 11. Other Signs which affect the Reading.

Very closely connected with the vowel points are the *reading-signs*, which were probably introduced at the same time. Besides the diacritical point over ש and שׁ , a point is placed *within* a consonant

¹ On יָתָּה as an ending of the 2nd sing. fem. perf. Qal of verbs הָלָה , see § 75 m .

to show that it has a stronger sound. On the other hand a horizontal stroke (*Rāphè*) over a consonant is a sign that it has *not* the stronger sound. According to the different purposes for which it is used the point is either (1) *Dageš forte*, a sign of strengthening (§ 12); or (2) *Dageš lene*, a sign of the harder pronunciation of certain consonants (§ 13); or (3) *Mappiq*, a sign to bring out the full consonantal value of letters which otherwise serve as vowel letters (§ 7 b), especially in the case of ן at the end of the word (§ 14 a). The *Rāphè*, which excludes the insertion of any of these points, has almost entirely gone out of use in our printed texts (§ 14 e).

§ 12. *Dageš in general*,¹ and *Dageš forte in particular*.

Cf. Graetz, 'Die mannigfache Anwendung u. Bedeut. des Dagesch,' in *Monatsschr. für Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judent.*, 1887, pp. 425 ff. and 473 ff.

1. *Dageš*, a point standing in the middle of a consonant,² denotes, *a* according to § 11, (a) the *strengthening*³ of a consonant (*Dageš forte*), e.g. קִטֵּל *qittēl* (§ 20); or (b) the *harder* pronunciation of the letters פִּנְיָהֻת (*Dageš lene*). For a variety of the latter, now rarely used in our printed texts, see § 13 c.

The root דגש in Syriac means *to pierce through, to bore through* (with sharp *b* iron); hence the name *Dageš* is commonly explained, solely with reference to its form, by *puncture, point*. But the names of all similar signs are derived rather from their grammatical significance. Accordingly דגש may in the Masora have the sense: *acuiere (literam)*, i.e. *to sharpen* a letter, as well as to *harden* it, i.e. to pronounce it as hard and without aspiration. דגש *acuens (literam)* would then be a sign of sharpening and hardening (like *Mappiq* מַפְּיֵק *proferens, as signum prolationis*), for which purposes a *prick* of the pen, or *puncture*, was selected. The opposite of *Dageš* is רפה *soft*, § 14 e, and § 22 n.

2. In grammar *Dageš forte*, the *sign of strengthening*, is the more *c* important. It may be compared to the *sicilicus* of the Latins (*Luculus* for *Lucullus*) or to the stroke over *m̄* and *n̄*. In the unpointed text it is omitted, like the vowels and other reading signs.

For the different kinds of *Dageš forte*, see § 20.

¹ Oort, *Theol. Tijdschr.* 1902, p. 376, maintains that 'the Masoretes recognized no distinction between *Dageš lene* and *forte*. They used a *Dageš* where they considered that a letter had the sharp, not the soft or aspirated sound.' This may be true; but the old-established distinction between the two kinds of *Dageš* is essential for the right understanding of the grammatical forms.

² Wāw with *Dageš* (ו) cannot in our printed texts be distinguished from a wāw pointed as Šūrēq (וּ); in the latter case the point should stand higher up. The וּ is, however, easily to be recognized since it cannot take a vowel before or under it.

³ Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, Lpz. 1879, pp. 44, 103, rightly insists on the expression *strengthened pronunciation* instead of the older term *doubling*, since the consonant in question is only written once. The common expression arises from the fact that in transcription a *strengthened* consonant can only be indicated by writing it as double.

§ 13. *Dageš lene*.Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 114 ff. : Dagesh and Raphe.

- a 1. *Dageš lene*, the sign of *hardening*, is in ordinary printed texts placed only within the בְּנִדְכָּת letters (§ 6 n) as a sign that they should be pronounced with their original hard sound (without aspiration), e.g. מֶלֶךְ *mèlèkh*, but מַלְכוֹ *maḷ-kô*; תָּפַר *tāphār*, but יִתְפֹּר *yith-pōr*; שָׂתָה *šāthā*, but יִשְׂתֶּה *yiš-tè*.
- b 2. The cases in which a *Dageš lene* is to be inserted are stated in § 21. It occurs almost exclusively at the beginning of words and syllables. In the middle of the word it can easily be distinguished from *Dageš forte*, since the latter always has a vowel before it, whereas *Dageš lene* never has; accordingly the *Dageš* in אִפִּי *'appî*, רַבִּים *rabbîm* must be *forte*, but in יִגְדַל *yigdal* it is *lene*.
- c A variety of the *Dageš lene* is used in many manuscripts, as well as in Baer's editions, though others (including Ginsburg in the first two cases, *Introd.*, pp. 121, 130, 603, 662) reject it together with the Hatafs discussed in § 10 g. It is inserted in consonants other than the *B^gadk^ephath* to call attention expressly to the beginning of a new syllable: (a) when the same consonant precedes in close connexion, e.g. בְּכָל־לֵבִי ψ 9², where, owing to the *Dageš*, the coalescing of the two *Lameds* is avoided; (b) in cases like מַחֲסִי ψ 62⁸ = *māh-sî* (not *māh^a-sî*); (c) according to some (including Baer; not in ed. Mant.) in לָא in the combination לָא לֹא Dt 32⁵, or לָא לֹא Hb 1⁶, 2⁶ &c. (so always also in Ginsburg's text, except in Gn 38⁹); see also § 20 e and g.—Delitzsch appropriately gives the name of *Dageš orthophonicum* to this variety of *Dageš* (*Bibl. Kommentar*, 1874, on ψ 94¹²); cf. moreover Delitzsch, *Luth. Ztschr.*, 1863, p. 413; also his *Complutensische Varianten zu dem Alttest. Texte*, Lpz. 1878, p. 12.
- d 3. When *Dageš forte* is placed in a *B^gadk^ephath*, the strengthening necessarily excludes its aspiration, e.g. אִפִּי, from אִפִּי.

§ 14. *Mappîq and Rāphè*.

- a 1. *Mappîq*, like *Dageš*, also a point *within* the consonant, serves in the letters וּי א ה as a sign that they are to be regarded as full consonants and not as vowel letters. In most editions of the text it is only used in the consonantal ה at the end of words (since ה can never be a vowel letter in the middle of a word), e.g. גַּבְהָהּ (to be high), אֶרְצָהּ *'arṣāh* (her land) which has a consonantal ending (shortened from *-hā*), different from אֶרְצָהּ *'árṣā* (to the earth) which has a vowel ending.
- b Rem. 1. Without doubt such a *Hē* was distinctly aspirated like the Arabic *Hā* at the end of a syllable. There are, however, cases in which this ה has lost its consonantal character (the *Mappîq* of course disappearing too), so that it remains only as a vowel letter; cf. § 91 e on the 3rd fem. sing.
- c The name מַפְיָק means *preferens*, i. e. a sign which brings out the sound of the letter distinctly, as a consonant. The same sign was selected for this

and for *Dageš*, since both are intended to indicate a hard, i. e. a strong, sound. Hence *Rāphè* (see e) is the opposite of both.

2. In MSS. *Mappiq* is also found with **Ⓜ**, **Ⓝ**, **Ⓞ**, to mark them expressly as consonants, e. g. **Ⓜ**י (gōy), **Ⓝ**ק (qāw, qāu), for which **Ⓞ** is also used, as **Ⓞ**שׁוּ, &c. For the various statements of the Masora (where these points are treated as *Dageš*), see Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, letter **Ⓜ**, § 5 (also *Introd.*, pp. 557, 609, 637, 770), and 'The Dageshed Alephs in the Karlsruhe MS.' (where these points are extremely frequent), in the *Verhandlungen des Berliner Orientalisten-Kongresses*, Berlin, i. 1881, p. 136 ff. The great differences in the statements found in the Masora point to different schools, one of which appears to have intended that every audible **Ⓜ** should be pointed. In the printed editions the point occurs only four times with **Ⓜ** (**Ⓜ** or **Ⓝ**), Gn 43²⁶, Lv 23¹⁷, Ezr 8¹⁸ and Jb 33²¹ (**Ⓜ**א; where the point can be taken only as an orthophonetic sign, not with König as *Dageš forte*). Cf. Delitzsch, *Hiob*, 2nd ed., p. 439 ff.

2. *Rāphè* (רַפֵּה i. e. weak, soft), a horizontal stroke over the letter, e is the opposite of both kinds of *Dageš* and *Mappiq*, but especially of *Dageš lene*. In exact manuscripts every בּגדכפת letter has either *Dageš lene* or *Rāphè*, e. g. מֶלֶךְ *mēlēkh*, שָׁתָה, תָּפַר. In modern editions (except Ginsburg's 1st ed.) *Rāphè* is used only when the absence of a *Dageš* or *Mappiq* requires to be expressly pointed out.

§ 15. The Accents.

On the ordinary accents (see below, e), cf. W. Heidenheim, מִשְׁפָּטֵי הַטַּעְמִים a [The Laws of the Accents], Rödelheim, 1808 (a compilation from older Jewish writers on the accents, with a commentary); W. Wickes (see also below), טַעְמֵי כ"א ספרים [The Accents of the Twenty-one Books], Oxford, 1887, an exhaustive investigation in English; J. M. Japhet, Die Accente der hl. Schrift (exclusive of the books אִמְרֵי), ed. by Heinemann, Frankf. a. M. 1896; Prätorius, Die Herkunft der hebr. Accente, Berlin, 1901, and (in answer to Gregory's criticism in the TLZ. 1901, no. 22) Die Uebnahme der früh-mittelgriech. Neumen durch die Juden, Berlin, 1902; P. Kahle, 'Zur Gesch. der hebr. Accente,' ZDMG. 55 (1901), 167 ff. (1, on the earliest Jewish lists of accents; 2, on the mutual relation of the various systems of accentuation; on p. 179 ff. he deals with the accents of the 3rd system, see above, § 8 g, note); Margolis, art. 'Accents,' in the Jewish Encycl. i (1901), 149 ff.; J. Adams, Sermons in Accents, London, 1906.—On the accents of the Books חֲמִשָּׁה (see below, h), S. Baer, תורת אמת [Accentual Laws of the Books חֲמִשָּׁה], Rödelheim, 1852, and his appendix to Delitzsch's Psalmencommentar, vol. ii, Lpz. 1860, and in the 5th ed., 1894 (an epitome is given in Baer-Delitzsch's Liber Psalmorum hebr., Lpz. 1861, 1874, 1880); cf. also Delitzsch's most instructive 'Accentuologischer Commentar' on Psalms 1–3, in his Psalmencommentar of 1874, as well as the numerous contributions to the accentual criticism of the text, &c., in the editions of Baer and Delitzsch, and in the commentaries of the latter; W. Wickes, טַעְמֵי אִמְרֵי [Accents of the Poet. Books], Oxford, 1881; Mitchell, in the Journal of Bibl. Lit., 1891, p. 144 ff.; Baer and Strack, Dikduke ha-t'p'amim, p. 17 ff.

1. As Prätorius (see above) has convincingly shown, the majority of b the Hebrew accents, especially, according to Kahle (see above), the 'Conjunctivi', were adopted by the Jews from the neums and punctuation-marks found in Greek gospel-books, and, like these, their primary purpose was to regulate minutely the public reading of the sacred

text. The complete transformation and amplification of the system (in three different forms, see § 8 g, note), which soon caused the Jews to forget its real origin, is clearly connected with the gradual change from the speaking voice in public reading to chanting or singing. The accents then served as a kind of musical notes.¹ Their value as such has, however, with the exception of a few traces, become lost in transmission. On the other hand, according to their original design they have also a twofold use which is still of the greatest importance for grammar (and syntax), viz. their value (a) as *marking the tone*, (b) as *marks of punctuation* to indicate the logical (syntactical) relation of single words to their immediate surroundings, and thus to the whole sentence.²

c 2. As a mark of the tone the accent stands almost invariably (but see below, e) with the syllable which has the principal tone in the word. This is usually the ultima, less frequently the penultima. Amongst the Jewish grammarians a word which has the tone on the ultima is called *Milra'* (Aram. מִלְרָע i.e. accented below³), e.g. קָטָל *qātāl*; a word which has the tone on the penultima is *Mil'el* (Aram. מִלְעֵיל, accented above), e.g. מֶלֶךְ *mēlēkh*. Besides this, in many cases a *secondary tone* is indicated in the word by *Methög* (cf. § 16). Examples such as יְהוָה נְעֻמָּה Is 50⁸ (cf. 40¹⁸, Ex 15⁸, Jb 12¹⁵, La 2¹⁶) are regarded by the Jewish grammarians as even *proparoxytone*.⁴

d 3. As marks of interpunctuation the accents are subdivided into those which *separate* (*Distinctivi* or *Domini*) and those which *connect* (*Conjunctivi* or *Servi*). Further a twofold system of accentuation is to be noted: (a) the common system found in twenty-one of the Books (the כ"א i.e. twenty-one), and (b) that used in the first three Books of the *Hagiographa*, viz. Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, for which the *vox memor.* is אָמֵן, from the initial consonants of the names, תְּהִלִּים Psalms, מִשְׁלֵי Proverbs, אִיּוֹב Job, or more correctly, according to their original sequence, תְּאֵם (תָּאֵם *twin*), so that מַעְמֵי תְאֵם means the accents (sing. טַעַם) of these three Books. The latter system is not only richer and more complicated in itself, but also musically more significant than the ordinary accentuation.

¹ On the attempts of Christian scholars of the sixteenth century to express the Hebrew accents by musical notes, cf. Ortenberg, *ZDMG.* 1889, p. 534.

² At the same time it must not be forgotten that the value of the accent as a mark of punctuation is always relative; thus, e.g. *'Athnāh* as regards the logical structure of the sentence may at one time indicate a very important break (as in Gn 1⁴); at another, one which is almost imperceptible (as in Gn 1¹).

³ 'Above' in this sense means what comes before, 'below' is what comes after; cf. Bacher, *ZAW.* 1907, p. 285 f.

⁴ Cf. Delitzsch on Is 40¹⁸.

I. The Common Accents.

Preliminary remark. The accents which are marked as *prepositive* stand to the right over or under the initial consonant of the word; those marked as *postpositive*, to the left over or under the last consonant. Consequently in both cases the tone-syllable must be ascertained independently of the accent (but cf. below, l).

A. DISJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (*Distinctivi* or *Domini*).¹

f

1. (—) סִלּוּק Sillûq (*end*) always with the tone-syllable of the last word before Sôph pāsûq (:), the verse-divider, e.g.: הָאָרֶץ.
2. (—) אֲתָנָה 'Athnâh or אֲתָנְתָּה 'Athnahtâ (*rest*), the principal divider within the verse.
- 3 a. (—) סְגוּלְתָּה Segôltâ, *postpositive*, marks the fourth or fifth subordinate division, counting backwards from 'Athnâh (e.g. Gn 1^{7.28}).
- 3 b. (|—) שַׁלְשֵׁלֶת Šalšelet (i.e. *chain*), as disjunctive, or Great Šalšelet, distinguished by the following stroke² from the conjunctive in the poetic accentuation, is used for

¹ All the disjunctives occur in Is 39².—The earlier Jewish accentuologists already distinguish between מְלָכִים *Reges* and מְשֻׁרְתִּים *Servi*. The division of the disjunctive accents into Imperatores, Reges, Duces, Comites, which became common amongst Christian grammarians, originated in the *Scrutinium S. S. ex accentibus* of Sam. Bohlius, Rostock, 1636, and, as the source of manifold confusion, had better be given up. The order of the accents in respect to their disjunctive power is shown in general by the above classification, following Wickes. In respect to the height of tone (in chanting) 1, 2, 5, 4, 8, which were *low* and long sustained notes, are to be distinguished from the *high* notes (7, 3^a, 6, 13, 9), and the highest (3^b, 11, 12, 10); cf. Wickes, N^o 12 ff.—The name מְשֻׁרְתִּים (later = accents in general) was originally restricted to the disjunctives, see Kahle, l. c., p. 169.

² This stroke is commonly confused with *Paseq*, which has the same form. But *Pāsēq* (= *restraining, dividing*, also incorrectly called *P^esiq*) is neither an independent accent, nor a constituent part of other accents, but is used as a mark for various purposes; see the Masoretic lists at the end of Baer's editions, and Wickes, *Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, p. 120 ff., where *Pāsēq* is divided into *distinctivum, emphaticum, homonymicum, and euphonicum*. The conjecture of Olshausen (*Lehrb.*, p. 86 f.), that *Pāsēq* served also to point out marginal glosses subsequently interpolated into the text, has been further developed by E. von Ortenberg, 'Die Bedeutung des Paseq für Quellenscheidung in den BB. d. A. T.,' in *Progr. des Domgymn. zu Verden*, 1887, and in the article, 'Paseq u. Legarmeh,' in *ZAW.* 1887, p. 301 ff. (but see Wickes, *ibid.* 1888, p. 149 ff.; also E. König, in the *Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben*, 1889, parts 5 and 6; Maas, in *Hebraica*, v. 121 ff., viii. 89 ff.). Prætorius, *ZDMG.* 1899, p. 683 ff., pointed out that *Paseq* (which is pre-masoretic and quite distinct from *L^egarmeh*) besides being a divider (used especially for the sake of greater clearness) also served as a sign of abbreviation. For further treatment of *Paseq* see H. Grimme, 'Pasekstudien,' in the *Bibl. Ztschr.*, i. 337 ff., ii. 28 ff., and *Psalmenprobleme*, &c., Freiburg (Switzerland), 1902, p. 173, where it is argued that *Paseq* indicates variants in a difficult sentence; J. Kennedy, *The Note-line in the Heb. Scriptures*, Edinb. 1903, with an index of all the occurrences of *Paseq*, p. 117 ff. According to Kennedy the 'note-line', of which he distinguishes sixteen different kinds, is intended to draw attention to some peculiarity in the text; it existed long before the Masoretes, and was no longer understood by them. See, however, the reviews of E. König, *Theol.*

Segôltā (seven times altogether) when this would stand at the head of the sentence; cf. Gn 19¹⁶, &c.

- 4 a. (𐤀) זָקֶף גָּדוֹל Zâqēph gādôl, and
 4 b. (𐤁) זָקֶף קָטוֹן Zâqēph qātôn. The names refer to their musical character. As a disjunctive, Little Zâqēph is by nature stronger than Great Zâqēph; but if they stand together, the one which comes first is always the stronger.
5. (𐤂) טִפְחָא Tiphhā or טַרְחָא Tarhā, a subordinate disjunctive before Sillûq and 'Athnāh, but very often the principal disjunctive of the whole verse instead of 'Athnāh; always so when the verse consists of only two or three words (e.g. Is 2¹⁸), but also in longer verses (Gn 3²¹).
6. (𐤃) רִבְחִיא Rebhîā.
7. (𐤄) זַרְקָא Zarqā, *postpositive*.
- 8 a. (𐤅) פַּשְׁטָא Paštā, *postpositive*,¹ and
 8 b. (𐤆) יֶתִיב Yethibh, *prepositive*, and thus different from Mehuppākh. Yethibh is used in place of Paštā when the latter would stand on a monosyllable or on a foretoned word, not preceded by a conjunctive accent.
9. (𐤇) תֵּבְחִיר Tebhîr.
- 10 a. (𐤈) גֵּרֶשׁ גָּדוֹל Gêreš or גֵּרֶשׁ טָרֶס Têres, and
 10 b. (𐤉) גֵּרָשָׁיִם Gerāšáyim² or Double Gêreš, used for Gêreš, when the tone rests on the ultima, and 'Azlā does not precede.
- 11 a. (𐤊) פָּזֶר Pâzēr, and
 11 b. (𐤋) זָקֶף גָּדוֹל Pâzēr gādôl (Great Pâzēr) or קַרְנֵי פָּרָה Qarnê phārā (cow-horns), only used 16 times, for special emphasis.
12. (𐤌) תֵּלִישָׁא גָּדוֹל Telišā gedôlā or Great Telišā, *prepositive*.
13. (𐤍) לְגַרְמֵה Legarmēh, i.e. Mûnah (see below) with a following stroke.

Stud. u. Krit., 1904, p. 448 ff., G. Beer, *TLZ.* 1905, no. 3, and esp. A. Klostermann, *Theol. Lit.-blatt*, 1904, no. 13, with whom Ginsburg agrees (*Verhandlungen des Hamb. Or.-kongresses von 1902*, Leiden, 1904, p. 210 ff.) in showing that the tradition with regard to the 479 or 480 uses of *Paseq* is by no means uniform. The purpose of *Paseq* is clearly recognizable in the five old rules: as a divider between identical letters at the end and beginning of two words; between identical or very similar words; between words which are absolutely contradictory (as *God* and *evil-doer*); between words which are liable to be wrongly connected; and lastly, between heterogeneous terms, as 'Eleazar the High Priest, and Joshua'. But the assumption of a far-reaching critical importance in *Paseq* is at least doubtful.—Cf. also the important article by H. Fuchs, 'Pesiḳ ein Glossenzeichen,' in the *Vierteljahrsschrift f. Bibelkunde*, Aug. 1908, p. 1 ff. and p. 97 ff.

¹ If the word in question has the tone on the penultima, Paštā is placed over it also, e.g. תָּהוּ Gn 1²; cf. below, l.

² Wickes requires Geršáyim (גֵּרְשָׁיִם).

B. CONJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (*Conjunctivi* or *Servi*).

g

14. (—) מִנַּח Mûnah.
 15. (—) מְהֻפָּךְ Mehuppākḥ or מַהְפָּךְ Mahpākḥ.
 16 a. (—) מֵרֶכָה or מְרֶכָה Mêrekḥā, and
 16 b. (—) מְרֶכָה כְּפֻלָּה Mêrekḥā khephûlā or Double Mêrekḥā.
 17. (—) דָּרְגָא Dargā.
 18. (—) אֲזֵלָא 'Azlā, when associated with Gêreš (see above) also called Qadmā.
 19. (—) תְּלִישָׁא קֶטְנָנָא Telīšā qeṭannā or Little Telišā, *postpositive*.
 20. (—) גַּלְגַּל Galgal or יְרַח Yèrah.
 [21. (—) מְאֵיילָא Me'ayyēlā or מֵאֵילָא Mâyēlā, a variety of Tiphḥa, serves to mark the secondary tone in words which have Sillûq or 'Athnāḥ, or which are united by Maqqēph with a word so accented, e.g. וַיֵּצֵא־נֶחֱלָא Gn 8¹⁸.]

II. The Accents of the Books תּא"ם

A. DISTINCTIVI.

h

1. (—) Sillûq (see above, I, 1).
 2. (—) עֹלֶה וְיֹרֵד 'Ôlè weyôrêd,¹ a stronger divider than
 3. (—) 'Athnāḥ (see above, I, 2). In shorter verses 'Athnāḥ suffices as principal distinctive; in longer verses 'Ôlè weyôrêd serves as such, and is then mostly followed by 'Athnāḥ as the principal disjunctive of the second half of the verse.
 4. (—) Rebhîa' gādôl (Great Rebhîa').
 5. (—) Rebhîa' mugraš, i.e. Rebhîa' with Gêreš on the same word.
 6. (—) Great Šalšēleth (see above, I. 3 b).
 7. (—) צִנּוֹר Šinnôr (Zarqā), as *postpositive*, is easily distinguished from צִנּוֹרִית Šinnôrîth similarly placed, which is not an independent accent, but stands only over an open syllable before a consonant which has Mêrekḥā or Mahpākḥ.
 8. (—) Rebhîa' qāṭôn (Little Rebhîa') immediately before 'Ôlè weyôrêd.
 9. (—) דֶּהִי Deḥî or Tiphḥā, *prepositive*, to the right underneath the initial consonant, e.g. דֶּהִי־גִבּוֹר (consequently it does not mark the tone-syllable).

¹ Wrongly called also Mêrekḥā mēhuppākḥ (*Mêrekḥa mahpakhatum*), although the accent underneath is in no way connected with Mêrekḥā; cf. Wickes, l. c., p. 14.

10. (ִ) Pázēr (see above, I, 11 a).

11 a. (|ֿ) Məhuppākh ləgarmēh, i.e. Mahpākh with a following stroke.

11 b. (|ֿ) 'Azlā ləgarmēh, i.e. 'Azlā with a following stroke.

i

B. CONJUNCTIVI.

12. (ֿֿ) Mērekhā (see above, I. 16 a).

13. (ֿֿ) Mūnaḥ (see above, I. 14).

14. (ֿֿֿ) עֲלִי 'Illūy or Mūnaḥ superior.

15. (ֿֿֿֿ) טַרְחָה Tarḥā (under the tone-syllable, and thus easily distinguished from No. 9).

16. (ֿֿֿ) Galgal or Yērah (see above, I. 20).

17. (ֿֿֿֿ) Məhuppākh or Mahpākh (see above, I. 15).

18. (ֿֿֿֿֿ) 'Azlā (see above, I. 18).

19. (ֿֿֿֿֿֿ) Šalšēleth qeṭannā (Little Šalšēleth).

The last three are distinguished from the disjunctives of the same name by the absence of the stroke.

[20. (ֿֿֿֿֿֿֿ) Šinnôrith, see above under No. 7.]

REMARKS ON THE ACCENTS.

I. *As Signs of the Tone.*

k 1. As in Greek and English (cf. *εἰμί* and *εἶμι*, *compact* and *compact*) so also in Hebrew, words which are written with the same consonants are occasionally distinguished by the position of the tone, e.g. בָּנִי *banû* (they built), בָּנִי *bānu* (in us); קָמָה *qāma* (she stood up), קָמָה *qamā* (standing up, *fem.*).

l 2. As a rule the accent stands on the tone-syllable, and properly on its initial consonant. In the case of prepositives and postpositives alone (see above, *e*) the tone-syllable must be ascertained independently of the accent. In many MSS. as well as in Baer's editions of the text, the postpositive sign in foretoned words stands also over the tone-syllable after the analogy of Paštā (see above, I. 8 a, note); e.g. יִשְׁכְּבוּ יָמָם Gn 19⁴; so the prepositive sign in cases like יְהִי Gn 8¹³.

II. *As Signs of Punctuation.*

m 3. In respect to this use of the accents, every verse is regarded as a period which closes with Sillûq, or in the figurative language of the grammarians, as a province (*ditio*) which is governed by the great distinctive at the end. According as the verse is long or short, i.e. the province great or small, there are several subordinate *Domini* of different grades, as governors of greater and smaller divisions. When possible, the subdivisions themselves are also split up into parts according to the law of dichotomy (see Wickes, *The Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, p. 29 ff).—When two or more equivalent accents (Zâqēph, R'bhia') occur consecutively, the accent which precedes marks a greater division than the one which follows; cf. e.g. the Zâqēph, Gn 1^{20 a}.

n 4. In general a conjunctive (*Servus*) unites only such words as are closely connected in sense, e.g. a noun with a following genitive or a noun with an

adjective. For the closest connexion between two or more words *Maqqēph* is added (§ 16 a).

5. The consecution of the several accents (especially the correspondence of *O* disjunctives with their proper conjunctives) conforms in the most minute details to strict rules, for a further investigation of which we must refer to the above-mentioned works. Here, to avoid misunderstanding, we shall only notice further the rule that in the accentuation of the books **תהי**, the *Rebhi^a* *mugrāš* before *Silluq*, and the *Dehi* before *Athnāh*, must be changed into conjunctives, unless at least two toneless syllables precede the principal disjunctive. For this purpose *Šwā mobile* after *Qameš*, *Sere*, or *Holem* (with *Metheg*) is to be regarded as forming a syllable. After *‘Olē w^eyōrēd* the *Athnāh* does not necessarily act as pausal (cf. Delitzsch on *ψ* 45⁶). The condition of our ordinary texts is corrupt, and the system of accents can only be studied in correct editions [see Wickes' two treatises].

6. A double accentuation occurs in Gn 35²², from **וישכב** onward (where *p* the later accentuation, intended for public reading, aims at uniting vv. 22 and 23 into one, so as to pass rapidly over the unpleasant statement in v. 22); and in the Decalogue, Ex 20^{2 ff.}; Dt 5^{6 ff.}. Here also the later (mainly superlinear) accentuation which closes the first verse with **עכרים** (instead of **פני**) is adopted simply for the purposes of public reading, in order to reduce the original twelve verses (with sublinear accentuation) to ten, the number of the Commandments. Thus **עכרים** at the end of v. 2 has *Silluq* (to close the verse) in the lower accentuation, but in the upper, which unites vv. 2-6 (the actual words of God) into a single period, only *Rebhi^a*. Again **פני**, regarded as closing v. 3, is pointed **פני** (pausal *Qameš* with *Silluq*), but in the upper accentuation it is **פני** with *Pathah* because not in pause. (Originally there may have been a third accentuation requiring **עכרים** and **פני**, and thus representing vv. 2 and 3 as the first commandment.) Further the upper accentuation unites vv. 8-11 into one period, while in vv. 12-15 the lower accentuation combines commandments 5-8 into one verse. Cf. Geiger, *Urschrift u. Übersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 373; Japhet, *op. cit.*, p. 158, and esp. K. J. Grimm, *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circ.* xix (May, 1900), no. 145.

§ 16. Of *Maqqēph* and *Methēg*.

These are both closely connected with the accents.

a

1. *Maqqēph* (**מקף** i.e. *binder*) is a small horizontal stroke between the upper part of two words which so connects them that in respect of tone and pointing they are regarded as one, and therefore have only one accent. Two, three, or even four words may be connected in this way, e.g. **בְּלֹאִם** every man, **אֶת־בְּלֹאִם** every herb, Gn 1²⁹, **אֶת־בְּלֹאִם** all that he had, Gn 25⁵.

Certain monosyllabic prepositions and conjunctions, such as **עַד** to, **אֶל** until, **עַל** upon, **עִם** with, **אֵל** ne, **אִם** if, whether, **מִן** from, **כִּי** lest, are almost always found with a following *Maqqēph*, provided they have not become independent forms by being combined with prefixes, e.g. **מִעַל**, **מִעִם**, in which case *Maqqēph* as a rule does not follow. Occasionally *Maqqēph* is replaced by a conjunctive accent (see above, § 9 a, 1 c), as, according to the Masora, in Dt 27⁹, 2 S 20²³, Jer 25⁵⁰, 29²⁵, Ec 9⁴ in the case of **אֶל**; *ψ* 47⁵, 60², Pr 3¹² in the case of **אֶת**, the objective particle. Longer words are, however, con-

nected by Maqqēph with a following monosyllable, e.g. הַתְּהַלְלֵהְנָה Gn 6⁹, וְיִהְיֶה־בָּן Gn 17; or two words of more than one syllable, e.g. שִׁבְעָה־עָשָׂר seventeen, Gn 7¹¹. Cf. the Greek proclitics ἐν, ἐκ, εἰς, εἰ, ὡς, οὐ, which are *atonic*, and lean on the following word.

C 2. *Mètheg* (מֶתֶג i.e. *a bridle*), a small perpendicular stroke under the consonant to the left of the vowel, indicates most frequently the secondary stress or counter-tone, as opposed to the principal tone marked by the accents. It serves, however, in other cases to point out that the vowel should not be hastily passed over in pronunciation, but should be allowed its full sound. Hence other names of *Mètheg* are *Ma'arikh*, i.e. *lengthener*, and *Ga'yā*, i.e. *raising of the voice*, which is *Great Ga'yā* with long vowels, otherwise *Little Ga'yā*.¹

d It is divided into: 1. The *light Mètheg*. This is subdivided again into (a) the ordinary *Mètheg* of the counter-tone, as a rule in the second (open) syllable before the tone, e.g. הָאֲרָם (cf. also such cases as מֶלֶךְ־צָר); but also in the third when the second is closed, e.g. הָאֲרָבָעִים (also in such cases as עֶבֶר־הַמֶּלֶךְ), and when the third is not suitable for it, even in the fourth (open) syllable before the tone. This *Mètheg* may be repeated in the fourth syllable before the tone, when it already stands in the second, e.g. שִׁבְעַתִּיכֶם. Finally it is always added to the vowel of an open ultima, which is joined by Maqqēph to a word beginning with a toneless syllable and so without *Mètheg* (e.g. בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל, on the other hand רִשְׁפִּיקֶשֶׁת, לֹא־אֶהְיָה), or to a word beginning with *Šewā* before the tone-syllable, e.g. מִי־לֶךְ, &c.; the object being to prevent the *Šewā* from becoming *quiescent*.

e The ordinary *light Mètheg* is omitted with a movable *copulative*, consequently we do not find וּבְנֵים, &c. (nor even וּבְנֵי, &c., contrary to b, a; but וּבָרַב, &c., according to b, δ, cf. § 10 g. b).

f (b) The *firm or indispensable Mètheg*. (a) With all long vowels (except in certain cases, *copulative*, see above), which are followed by a *Šewā mobile* preceding the tone-syllable, e.g. יִשְׁנֹו, יִרְאוּ, &c. (β) To emphasize a long vowel in a closed syllable immediately before Maqqēph, e.g. נֶשְׁתִּי Gn 4²⁵ (not *šōth-ti*); hence also with פָּל־ψ 138², and אֶת־Jb 41²⁶ (for פָּל־ and אֶת־; cf. also מֵאֶת־Jo 15¹⁸, &c.). (γ) With *Sere*, which has become toneless through retraction of the tone, in order to prevent its being pronounced as *Sēghôl*, e.g. אֶהְיֶה דַעַת Pr 12¹ (not *ôhēbh*). (δ) With all vowels before composite *Šewā*, e.g. יַעֲמֹד, נַעֲקִים, &c. (except when the following consonant is strengthened, e.g. יַקְבֹּנוּ Is 62², because the strengthening by *Dageš* excludes the retarding of the vowel by *Mètheg*); so in the cases discussed in § 28 c, where a short vowel has taken the place of a *Ḥateph*, as יַעֲמֹדוּ, &c. (ε) In the preformative syllable of all forms of הִיָּה to be, and תִּהְיֶה to live, when *Šewā quiescens* stands under the ה or ת, e.g. יִהְיֶה, תִּהְיֶה (yih-yè, tih-yè), &c., cf.

¹ Cf. as the source of this account of *Mètheg*, the exhaustive treatment by S. Baer, 'Mètheg-Setzung nach ihren überlieferten Gesetzen,' in A. Merx's *Archiv für die wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. Test.*, Heft i, Halle, 1867, p. 56 ff., and Heft ii. 1868, p. 194 ff.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-š'amim*, p. 30 ff.

§ 63 q. (§) With the Qames of the plural forms of בַּיִת *house* (thus בַּיִתִּים *bāttim*, cf. § 96 under בַּיִת), and with אָנָּה¹ *prithēe!* to guard against the pronunciation *bōttim*, *ōnnā*.—Every kind of light Mèthëg may in certain circumstances be changed into a conjunctive accent, e. g. בַּיִתִּים² Ch 34¹¹, &c.

2. The *grave Mèthëg* (*Ga'yā* in the more limited sense) is especially employed^g in the following cases in order more distinctly to emphasize a short vowel or an initial Šwā: (a) with the Pathah of the article or of the prefixes ב, כ, ל, when followed by Šwā under a consonant without Dageš, e. g. הַמֶּסְלָה, לְמֶסְלָה, &c., but not before י (before which י also remains without Mèthëg, with the exception of יִיָּהּ and יִיָּהּ, when they are followed by *Maqqēph*, or accented with *Paštā*), nor before the tone-syllable of a word, and neither *before* nor *after* the common Mèthëg; likewise not in words which are connected by a conjunctive accent with the following word; (b) with the interrogative הַ with Pathah (except when it precedes י, *Dageš forte* or the tone-syllable of the word), e. g. הַהֲרִים. When a Šwā follows the הַ and after the Šwā there is an untuned syllable, Baer places the Mèthëg to the right of the Pathah, e. g. הַבְּרָכָה Gn 27³⁸ (but ed. Mant. and Ginsb. 'הַבְּ); (c) with the Pathah or S'gol of the article before a guttural (which cannot take Dageš), e. g. הַחַיִּים, הַהֲרִים.—The Šwā-*Ga'yā* (י) is especially important in the accentuation of the תַּא"ם, for purposes of musical recitation; it stands chiefly in words whose principal tone is marked by a disjunctive without a preceding conjunctive, e. g. וְיִיָּהּ ψ 1⁸.

3. The *euphonic Ga'yā*, to ensure the distinct pronunciation of those consonants which in consequence of the loss of the tone, or because they close a syllable, might easily be neglected, e. g. וַיִּשְׁבַּע לוֹ Gn 24⁹; וַיִּדְבַּר אֲרָם (here to avoid a hiatus) 28², or in such cases as וַיִּתֵּן אֶל־ Jb 33⁴, &c.; וַיִּתֵּן Gn 1¹¹.

Mèthëg (especially in the cases mentioned in 1, b, a) is a guide to correctⁱ pronunciation, since it distinguishes ā from ö (except in the case noted in § 9 v, b) and î from ï; e. g. אָכְלָה 'ā-kh^olā (she has eaten), but אֲכָלָה 'ākh^{lā} (food), since the א stands here in a toneless closed syllable, and must therefore be a short vowel; thus also יָרְאוּ yî-rē'û (they fear), but יִרְאוּ yîr'û (they see), יִשְׁנוּ (they sleep), but יִשְׁנוּ (they repeat). The Jewish grammarians, however, do not consider the syllables lengthened by Mèthëg as open. They regard the Šwā as *quiescent* in cases like אָכְלָה, and belonging to the preceding vowel; cf. Baer, *Thorat 'Emeth*, p. 9, and in Merx's *Archiv*, i. p. 60, Rem. 1, and especially *Dikduke ha-t'amim*, p. 13.

§ 17. Of the Q^{eré} and K^{ethîbh}. *Masora marginalis and finalis*.

On Q^{eré} and K^{ethîbh} see Ginsburg, *Intr.*, p. 183 ff.]

1. The margin of Biblical MSS. and editions exhibits variants^a of an early date (§ 3 c), called קָרִי² to be read, since, according to

¹ The common form is קָרִי, with an accent on both syllables, in which case, according to Qimhi, the tone is always to be placed on the former. For the above mode of writing and position of the tone cf. Is 38³, Jon 1¹⁴, 4², ψ 116⁴.

² On the necessity of the punctuation קָרִי as passive participle (= *legendum*)

the opinion of the Jewish critics, they are to be preferred to the **כְּתִיב**, i.e. what is *written* in the text, and are actually to be read instead of it.

On this account the vowels of the marginal reading (the *Q^{erê}*) are placed under the consonants of the text, and in order to understand both readings properly, the vowels in the text must be applied to the marginal reading, while for the reading of the text (the *K^{ethîbh}*) its own vowels are to be used. Thus in Jer 42⁶ **אָנִי** occurs in the text, in the margin **אָנִי קְרִי**. Read **אָנִי** *we* (or according to Jewish tradition **אָנִי**) in the text, in the margin **אָנִי קְרִי**. A small circle or asterisk in the text always refers to the marginal reading.

b 2. Words or consonants which are to be passed over in reading, and are therefore left unpointed, are called **כְּתִיב וְלֹא קְרִי** (*scriptum et non legendum*), e.g. **אֵת** Jer 38¹⁶, **אִם** 39¹², **יִרְדָּךְ** 51³. Conversely, words not contained in the text, but required by the Masora (as indicated by the insertion of their vowels), are called **קְרִי וְלֹא כְּתִיב**, e.g. 2 S 8³, Jer 31³⁸. See further Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 85; *Dikduke ha-ʿamim*, §§ 62, 64; Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 49 ff.

C 3. In the case of some very common words, which are *always* to be read otherwise than according to the *K^{ethîbh}*, it has not been considered necessary to place the *Q^{erê}* in the margin, but its vowels are simply attached to the word in the text. This *Q^{erê perpetuum}* occurs in the Pentateuch in **הָיָא** (*Q^{erê} הָיָא*) wherever **הָיָא** stands for the feminine (§ 32 l), and in **נָעַר** (*K^{ethîbh} נָעַר, Q^{erê} נָעָרָה*) always, except in Dt 22¹⁹ (but the Sam. text always has **הָיָא**, *נָעָרָה*). The ordinary explanation of this supposed archaism, on the analogy of Greek *ὁ παῖς* and *ἡ παῖς*, our *child*, is inadequate, since there is no trace elsewhere of this epicene use; **נָעַר** for *נָעָרָה* is rather a survival of a system of orthography in which a final vowel was written defectively, as in **קָטַלְתָּ**; cf. § 2 n.—Other instances are: **יִשְׁכָּר** (*Q. יִשְׁכָּר*) Gn 30¹⁸ &c., see the *Lexicon*, and Baer and Delitzsch, *Genesis*, p. 84, and below, note to § 47 b; **יְרוּשָׁלַם** (*Q. יְרוּשָׁלַם*), properly **יְרוּשָׁלַם**; **יְהוָה** (*Q. יְהוָה* the Lord), or (after **יְהוָה**) properly **יְהוָה** (*Q. יְהוָה*) *Yahwè* (cf. § 102 m, and § 135 q, note); on **שָׁתִי**, **שָׁנִי** for *שָׁתִי*, see § 97 d, end.

d 4. The masoretic apparatus accompanying the biblical text is divided into (a) *Masora marginalis*, consisting of (a) *Masora (marginalis) magna* on the upper and lower margins of MSS.; (β) *Masora (marginalis) parva* between and on the right and left of the columns;

instead of **קְרִי** *Q^{eri}*, which was formerly common but is properly a past tense (= *lectum est*), see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 81, note.

(b) *Masora finalis* at the end of the several books, counting Samuel, Kings, Minor Prophets, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, each as one book. On all three varieties see especially Ginsburg, *Introd.*, p. 423 ff., and the appendices containing (p. 983 ff.) the masoretic treatise from the St. Petersburg MS. of A.D. 1009, and (p. 1000 ff.) specimens of the *Masora parva* and *magna* on two chapters.

In nearly all printed editions only the *Masora finalis* is found, indicating the number of verses, the middle point of the book, &c., and a scanty selection from the *Masora parva*. The following alphabetical list of technical expressions (some of them Aramaic) and abbreviations, may suffice with the help of the lexicon to elucidate the subject. Further details will be found in the appendix to Teile's edition of the Hebrew O. T., p. 1222 ff.

אות letter. אָלָא nisi, except. אֶמְצַע middle. אֶתְנַח סוף פסוק=אס"ף in the formula אֶתְנַח סוף פסוק בלא אס"ף without 'Athnah or Soph-pasuq i.e. although no 'Athnah or Soph-pasuq is written.

בְּ with, before names of vowels or accents, as קָמֶץ בְּזָקֶף Qameṣ with Zaqeph used instead of Pathah (§ 29 i).—ב' as a numeral=two, as in טַעֲמִים ב' two accents. במקצת, see מְקַצֵּת. בְּנוֹסְחָא אֲחֵרִינָא=בנ"א (Aramaic) in another copy; pl. בְּנוֹסְחָא אֲחֵרִין.—בספרים אחרים=בס"א in other books. בְּתַר (Aram.) after. דָּגוּשׁ fem. דְּגוּשָׁה marked with Dageṣ (or Mappiq). דָּף leaf, page.

זָעִיר fem. זְעִירָא (Aram.) small.

חול profane, not sacred, e.g. אֲרֵנִי Gn 19² because not referring to God. חוץ except. חָסֵר written defectively, also wanting as א' ח' aleph is omitted.

טַעַם accent (see ב); טָעַם in Hiphil to chant an accent.

יָתִיר superfluous.

כָּאן here. כָּלָל (Aram.) total, as adv. in general.

לֹא לִית (Aram., from אֵית לָא non est)=the form is not found elsewhere.

מְדוּקָה accurately corrected. מְלֵא full i.e. written plene. מִלְמַטָּה below=מִלְמַטָּה (§ 15 c). מְלֵעִיל=מְלֵעִיל (§ 15 c). מְנוּחָרוֹת separated, the name of the strangely formed Nûns before ψ 107²³ ff. (§ 5 n). מְקַרָּא that which is read, the name for all the O. T. scriptures. מְקַצֵּת part.

נָח fem. נָחָה quiescent, i.e. not sounded. נֶעְלָם concealed, i.e. only retained orthographically. נָקוּד a point. נִקְוֶד pointed.

ס"ס see ב. סִימָן σημειον, sign, esp. a mnemonic word or, frequently, sentence.

סך=סכום total. סוף פסוק=ס"ף (§ 15 f).

עמוד column of a page.

פ' בְּאֶמְצַע פסוק a פסוקא a space, esp. in the phrase פ' בְּאֶמְצַע פסוק a space within a verse, e.g. Gn 35²²; cf. H. Grätz, *Monatschrift für Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judentums*, 1878, p. 481 ff., and H. Strack, *ibid.* 1879, p. 26 ff.

ק' קָמֶץ, see above, c. קָרָם properly קָרָם before. קָמֶץ fem. קְמוּצָה pointed with Qameṣ.

קורא reader of the sacred text.

רַבָּתִי, רַבָּתִי, רַבָּתִי (Aram., all fem. sing.) large.

תְּלִיבָה word (consisting of more than one letter). תְּלִיבָה suspensa (§ 5 n, note 3). תְּרִי (Aram.) two.

CHAPTER II

PECULIARITIES AND CHANGES OF LETTERS: THE SYLLABLE AND THE TONE

§ 18.

THE changes which take place in the forms of the various parts of speech, depend partly on the peculiar nature of certain classes of letters and the manner in which they affect the formation of syllables, partly on certain laws of the language in regard to syllables and the tone.

§ 19. *Changes of Consonants.*

a The changes which take place among consonants, owing to the formation of words, inflexion, euphony, or to influences connected with the progress of the language, are *commutation, assimilation, rejection, addition, transposition, softening.*

1. *Commutation*¹ may take place between consonants which are either *homorganic* or *homogeneous* (cf. § 6 *q*), e.g. עָלַן, עָלַם, עָלוּ to *exult*, לָאָה, לָהָה, Aram. לָעָה to *be weary*, לָחַץ and לָחַץ to *press*, סָגַר and סָכַר to *close*, מָלַט and פָּלַט to *escape*. In process of time, and partly under the influence of Aramaic, the harder and rougher sounds especially were changed into the softer, e.g. שָׁחַץ into שָׁחַץ to *laugh*, לָעַץ into לָאָץ to *reject*, and the sibilants into the corresponding mutes: י into ר, ש into ת, צ into ט. In many cases these mutes may be regarded as a return to an earlier stage of the pronunciation.

The interchange of consonants, however, belongs rather to the lexicographical treatment of stems² than to grammatical inflexion. To the latter belong the interchange (*a*) of ת and ט in *Hithpa'el* (§ 54 *b*); (*b*) of ו and י in verbs *primae* Yôd (§ 69), יָלַךְ for יָלַךְ, &c.

b 2. *Assimilation* usually takes place when one consonant which closes a syllable passes over into another beginning the next syllable, and forms with it a strengthened letter, as *illustris* for *inlustris*, *affero* for *adfero*, συλλαμβάνω for συνλαμβάνω. In Hebrew this occurs,

¹ Cf. Barth, *Etymologische Forschungen*, Lpz. 1893, p. 15 ff. ('Lautverschiebungen').

² See in the *Lexicon*, the preliminary remarks on the several consonants.

(a) most frequently with נ, e.g. מִשָּׁם (for *min-šām*) *from there*, מִן (for *min-zē*) *from this*, יָתֵן (for *yintēn*) *he gives*. נ is not assimilated after the prefix ל, e.g. לִתֵּן, nor as a rule before gutturals (except sometimes before ח), nor when it is the third consonant of the stem, e.g. שָׁבַחַת (cf. however נָחַת for *nāthāntā*) except when another *Nun* follows, cf. § 44 o; nor in some isolated cases, as Dt 33⁹, Is 29¹, 58³, all in the principal pause; on הִנְדִּיף and הִנְדִּיף ψ 68³, see § 51 k, and § 66 f.

(b) Less frequently and only in special cases with ל, ח, ד, e.g. יָקַח *d* (for *yilqah*) *he takes*; מִדְּבַר for *mithdabbēr*; יִטַּמָּא for *yithtammā*; תִּתְּכֹנֵן for *tithkônēn*; תִּתְּנֶשֶׂא for *tithnēšā*; אָחַד for *'ahādī*; but in 1 S 4¹⁹ for לָלַח read probably לָלַח.

(c) In isolated cases with ה, ו, י, e.g. אָפְּרִיחֵהּ *prithēe!* if from אָפַח; e and י mostly before sibilants in the verbal forms enumerated in § 71.

In all these cases, instead of the assimilated letter, a *Dageš forte* *f* appears in the following consonant. *Dageš*, however, is omitted when the strengthened consonant would stand at the end of a word, since the strengthening would then be less audible (§ 20 l), e.g. אָף *nose* (from *'anp*), תִּתַּח *to give* (from *tint*).

The cases are less frequent where a weak letter is lost in pronunciation,¹ and in place of it the preceding stronger sound is sharpened, i.e. takes *Dageš*, e.g. קָטַלְתָּהוּ from קָטַלְתָּהוּ (§ 59 g). אָפַח for אָפַח (§ 66 e) is an Aramaism.

3. Complete rejection takes place only in the case of weaker consonants, especially the sonants נ and ל, the gutturals א and ה, and the two half vowels ו and י. Such rejection takes place,

(a) at the beginning of a word (*aphaeresis*), when these weak consonants (א, י, ל, נ) are not supported by a full vowel, but have only Šewâ, e.g. נָחֵנוּ *we*, also אָנַחֵנוּ; יָדַע for יָדַע; קַח for לָקַח; נִנְשׂ for נִנְשׂ, יָהּ for יָהּ Ez 2¹⁰.

Aphaeresis of a weak consonant with a full vowel is supposed to occur in יָדַע Ju 19¹¹ for יָדַע; in תָּתַח 2 S 22⁴¹ for תָּתַח; in יָשׁוּב Je 42¹⁰; on קַח Ez 17⁵ for לָקַח, and on קָחַם Ho 11³ for לָקַח, see § 66 g, end. In reality, however, all these forms are to be regarded merely as old textual errors.

(b) In the middle of a word (*syncope*), when Šewâ precedes the weak consonant²; thus in the case of אָ (see further § 23 b-f, and

¹ Such a suppression of a letter is sometimes inaccurately called 'backward assimilation'.

² Syncope of a strong consonant (ע) occurs in אָפְּרִיחֵהּ *prithēe!* if this stands for אָפַח (see *Lexicon*), also in וְנִשְׁקָה Am 8³, קֶתִּיבָהּ for וְנִשְׁקָה (cf. וְנִשְׁקָה 9⁵), and

§ 68 b-k), e.g. in מום for מואם. As a rule in such cases, however, the ׀ is orthographically retained, e.g. לקראת for לקראת. Syncope occurs frequently in the case of ה, e.g. להפלה for להפלה (§ 23 k and § 35 n), יקטיל for יקטיל (§ 53 a).

Syncope of ׀ with Šewâ occurs in such cases as בארני for בארני (cf. § 102 m); ואתער Zc 11⁵.¹ On the cases in which ׀ is wholly omitted after the article, see § 35 d.

Finally, the elision of ו and י in verbs ל'ה (§ 75 h) is an instance of syncope.—On the syncope of ה between two vowels, see § 23 k.

l (c) At the end of a word (*apocope*), e.g. גלה pr. name of a city (cf. גילוני Gilonite); וירא, where ׀ though really rejected is orthographically retained, &c. On the apocope of ו and י in verbs ל'ה, see § 24 g, and § 75 a.

Bolder changes (especially by violent apocope), took place in earlier periods of the language, notably the weakening of the feminine ending ת—āth to ת—ā, see § 44 a, and § 80 f.

m 4. To avoid harshness in pronunciation a helping sound, Aleph prosthetic² with its vowel, is prefixed to some words, e.g. אורוע and אורע arm (cf. χθές, ἐχθές; spiritus, French esprit).—A prosthetic ע occurs probably in עקרב scorpion; cf. Arab. 'usfûr bird (stem safara).

n 5. *Transposition*³ occurs only seldom in the grammar, e.g. השתמר for התשמר (§ 54 b) for the sake of euphony; it is more frequent in the lexicon (בבש and בבש lamb, שמלה and שמלה garment), but is mostly confined to sibilants and sonants.

o 6. *Softening* occurs e.g. in כוכב star, from kaukabh=kawkabh for kabhkabh (cf. Syriac raurab=rabrab); מוטפות phylacteries for taph-tāphôth; according to the common opinion, also in איש man from 'inš, cf. however § 96.

§ 20. The Strengthening (Sharpening) of Consonants.

a 1. The strengthening of a consonant, indicated by *Dageš forte*, is necessary and essential (*Dageš necessarium*)

(a) when the same consonant would be written twice in succession

in בלה Jos 19³ for בעלה (as in 15²⁹). Probably, however, ונשקה and בלה are only clerical errors, as is undoubtedly באר Am 8³ for ביאר (9⁵).

¹ Frensdorff, *Ochla W'ochla*, p. 97 f., gives a list of forty-eight words with quiescent ׀.

² This awkward term is at any rate as suitable as the name *Alef prostheticum* proposed by Nestle, *Marginalien u. Materialien*, Tübingen, 1893, p. 67 ff.

³ Cf. Barth, *Etymologische Studien*, Lpz. 1893, p. 1 ff.; Königsberger, in *Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1894, p. 451 ff.

without an intermediate vowel or *Šewā mobile*; thus we have נָתַנִּי for נָתַן without an intermediate vowel or *Šewā mobile*; thus we have נָתַנִּי for נָתַן.

(b) in cases of assimilation (§ 19 b-f), e.g. יִתֵּן for *yintēn*.

In both these cases the *Dageš* is called *compensativum*.

(c) When it is characteristic of a grammatical form, e.g. לָמַד *he has learned*, לָמַד *he has taught* (*Dageš characteristicum*). In a wider sense this includes the cases in which a consonant is sharpened by *Dageš forte*, to preserve a preceding short vowel (which in an open syllable would have to be lengthened by § 26 e), e.g. גַּמְלִים *camels* for *gēmālīm*; cf. § 93 ee and kk, § 93 pp.

This coalescing of two consonants as indicated above does not take place when the first has a vowel or *Šewā mobile*. In the latter case, according to the correct Masora, a compound *Šewā* should be used, preceded by *Métheg*, e.g. הַלְלִים, קַלְלִים, &c. (cf. § 16). This pointing is not used before the suffix הַ, e.g. הַלְלִיךָ Gn 27⁴, but the first ל has a vocal *Šewā*, otherwise the second ל would have *Dageš lene*. Also when the former of the two consonants has been already strengthened by *Dageš forte*, it can only have a vocal *Šewā*, and any further contraction is therefore impossible. This applies also to cases where *Dageš forte* has been omitted (see below, m), e.g. הַלְלִי properly הַלְלִי = *hal-lēlū*. The form הַלְלִיךָ ψ 9¹⁴ (not הַלְלִיךָ) might be explained as imperat. Pi'el = הַלְלִיךָ; if it were imperat. Qal the non-contraction of the monosyllabic root would be as strange as it is in שָׁרְרוּ Jer 49²⁸, and in the imperf. יִשְׁרְרוּ Jer 5⁶.

2. A consonant is sometimes strengthened merely for the sake of *euphony* (*Dageš euphonicum*), and the strengthening is then not so essential. This occurs¹—

(a) when two words are closely united in pronunciation by *Dageš forte conjunctivum*: (1) in the first letter of a monosyllable or of a word having the tone (or occasionally the counter-tone) on the first syllable,² when closely connected with the preceding word, if that word ends in a tone-bearing *Qames* (הַ) with *Šewā mobile* preceding, or a tone-bearing הַ, —called הִחִיק (i. e. *compressed*) by the Jewish grammarians.

The term monosyllable here and in f (by § 28 e) includes Segholates like שָׁחַד, &c., as well as forms like שָׁחַד, שָׁחַל, שָׁחַל, and even כָּנַעַן.

¹ Cf. Baer, 'De primarum vocabulorum literarum dagessatione,' in his *Liber Proverbiorum*, Lpz. 1880, pp. vii-xv; F. Prätorius, 'Über den Ursprung des Dag. f. conjunctivum,' in *ZAW*. 1883, p. 17 ff. (ascribed to an original assimilation of ה or נ).

² לָאמַר alone, although having the tone on the ultima, invariably takes the *Dageš forte conj.* when כִּשְׁהָ with a conjunctive accent precedes, Ex 6^{10.29}, 15²⁴, &c.

Some limit the use of the *Dēhiq* to the closest connexion of a monosyllable with a following *Bēgadkēphath*. However, it also applies to cases like לְכֶה־נָא Nu 22⁶; לִקְחֶה־זֹאת Gn 23³; יִצְוֶה־לָךְ ψ 91¹¹; and even with *Rēš*, מַעֲנֶה־רֶךְ Pr 15¹; וַיִּשְׁנֶה־כָּסֶף Gn 43¹⁵. In all these examples the tone, were it not for the *Maqqēph*, would be on the ultima of the first word.

d Rem. 1. When וְ this, has *Maqqēph* after it, a *Dageš forte conj.* always follows, even if the next word is neither ■ monosyllable nor has the tone on the initial syllable; thus not only in וְוֶה־שָׁמוֹ Jer 23⁶, but also in וְוֶה־פְּרִיָה Nu 13²⁷, 1 Ch 22¹. In הִנֵּה נָא Gn 19² (where *Maqqēph* is represented by a conjunctive accent, § 9 u, 1 c, and § 16 b), the *Sēghōl* coincides with the secondary tone-syllable. On the origin of *Dag. f. conj.* after מֶה־ (for מָה) what?, see § 37 b, c.

e 2. Such cases as נָאָה Gn 15^{1,21}, the 2nd בְּמִכָּה in ver. 11, נָאָל ver. 13, בְּאֵרֶן ver. 16, do not belong here. In these the *Dageš* can only be intended for *Dag. lenē*, see § 21 d.

f (2) In the first letter of a monosyllable, or of a word with the tone on the first syllable after a closely connected *mil'el* ending in ׀־ or ׀־־. Such a *mil'el* is called by the Jewish grammarians אֲתִי מִרְחִיק (Aram. = Heb. אֲתָה מִרְחִיק) *veniens e longinquo* (in respect of the tone). The attraction of the following tone-syllable by *Dageš forte conj.* is here also due to the exigencies of rhythm, e.g. שְׁבִיתִי שָׁבִי ψ 68¹⁹; הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא ψ 118²⁵ (so ed. Mant., but Ginsburg and Kittel הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא); אֲרָצָה בְּנָעֹן Is 5¹⁴; אֲרָצָה Gn 11³¹. The *Mil'el* may, however, also be due to a subsequent retraction of the tone (*nāsōg 'ahôr*, § 29 e), as in עֲשֵׂה פְרִי Gn 1¹¹.—The prefixes כִּי, כִּי, לִי and וְ alone do not take a *Dageš* in this case, except in לִי, always, and לִי־לָהּ ψ 19³. Such forms as הִשְׁבַּעָה לִי Gn 21²³, מָלָאָה שָׁחַד ψ 26¹⁰, רָחֲמָה מִנִּי Jb 21¹⁶, and even נַעֲמָדָה יַחַד Is 50⁸ (i.e. the cases where the tone is thrown back from the ultima on to the syllable which otherwise would have *Metheg*), are likewise regarded as *mil'el*. On the other hand, e.g. תָּרָה לָהּ Gn 4⁶, not לָהּ since the first *ā* of תָּרָה could not have *Metheg*. When words are closely united by *Maqqēph* the same rules apply as above, except that in the first word *Metheg*, in the secondary tone, takes the place of the accent, cf. עֲשֵׂה־פְרִי Gn 1¹²; הִנֵּדָה־נָא Gn 32³⁰, &c. Finally, the *Dageš* is used when the attracted word does not begin with the principal tone, but with a syllable having *Metheg*, הִפְחֵה יִרְשׁוֹ ψ 37⁹; אֵלָה יַעֲקֹב Is 44²¹; עֲשִׂיתָ פְּעֻרָתִי Ex 25²⁹, provided that the second word does not begin with a *Bēgadkēphath* letter (hence e.g. אֵלָה תוֹלְדוֹת Gn 2⁴).

g Rem. Such cases as פָּנָךְ Dt 32⁶, and בְּשִׁיתָ 32¹⁵, and נָעוּת (so Baer, but not ed. Mant., &c.) 1 S 1¹³ are therefore anomalous; also, because beginning with

a B^gadk^ephath, בָּאֵלִים Ex 15¹¹ (cf. however above, *e*); בְּזֹרֶעַ Jos 8²⁸; בְּזֹרֶעַ ψ 77¹⁶; בֶּן־הָיָא Jb 5²⁷.—It is doubtful whether we should include here those cases in which *Dageš forte* occurs after a word ending in a toneless *û*, such as קָמוּ צֶאֱזָא Gn 19¹⁴, Ex 12³¹; Ex 12¹⁵ (צֶאֱזָא), Dt 2²⁴; also לֹא Gn 19², 1 S 8¹⁹; לוֹ Ju 18¹⁹, Est 6¹³ (where P. Haupt regards the *Dageš* as due to the enclitic character of the לוֹ); מָעַט Ho 8¹⁰; נָדָו Jer 49⁸⁰; נָדָו 1 S 15⁶. When we explained the *Dageš* in these examples not as conjunctive, but orthophonic (see above, § 13 c, and Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 4th ed. on ψ 94^{12 a}), we especially had in view those cases in which the consonant with *Dageš* has a *Šewâ*. The extension of the use of *Dageš* to consonants with a strong vowel, seems, however, to indicate that these are cases of the אֲחִי מִרְחִיק, which was required by some Masoretes but not consistently inserted. On the other hand, the *Dageš forte* in י after a preceding *i* (ψ 118^{5,18}), and even after *û* (ψ 94¹²), is due to an attempt to preserve its consonantal power; see König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 54 b.

(b) When a consonant with *Šewâ* is strengthened by *Dageš forte h dirimens* to make the *Šewâ* more audible. In almost all cases the strengthening or sharpening can be easily explained from the character of the particular consonant, which is almost always a sonant, sibilant, or the emphatic *Qôph*; cf. עֲנִיָּי Lv 25⁵, Dt 32³² (for עֲנִיָּי); בְּנִלְתָּךְ Is 33¹ (where, however, בְּנִלְתָּךְ is to be read); cf. נָא 3¹⁷, Jb 9¹⁸, 17², Jo 1¹⁷ (with מ); Is 57⁶ (with ל); Ju 20^{43,1}, 1 S 1⁶ (with ר); Gn 49^{10,17} (and so always in עֲקֹבֵי Ju 5²², Ct 1⁸ and עֲקֹבוֹת ψ 77²⁰, 89⁵²); Ex 15¹⁷, Dt 23¹¹, Ju 20³², 1 S 28¹⁰ (ק)²; Ex 2³, Is 58³, Am 5²¹, ψ 141³, Pr 4¹³ (צ); Pr 27²⁵ (ש); Is 5²⁸, ψ 37¹⁵, Jer 51⁵⁶, Neh 4⁷ (ש). Also, with כ Ho 3²; with ב Is 9³, Jer 4⁷; with ת 1 S 10¹¹. In many instances of this kind the influence of the following consonant is also observable.

(c) When a vowel is to be made specially emphatic, generally in *i* the principal *pause*, by a *Dageš forte affectuosum* in the following consonant. Thus in a following sonant, Ju 5⁷ (חֲדָלָה), Jb 29²¹ (וַיִּחַלֵּה), 22¹² (רָפוּי); Ez 27¹⁹ (in נ); in ת Is 33¹², 41¹⁷, Jer 51⁵⁸, perhaps also Jb 21¹³ (יִחַתָּ).

(d) When the sonants ל, מ, נ are strengthened by *Dageš forte firmativum* in the pronouns הֵלָמָה, הֵלָה, אֵלָה, and in לָמָה *why?* cf. also בִּמָּה, בִּמָּה *whereby?* בִּמָּה *how much?* (§ 102 k, l), to give greater firmness to the preceding tone-vowel.

3. Omission of the strengthening, or at least the loss of the *Dageš l forte* occurs,

(a) almost always at the end of a word, since here a strengthened

¹ The ordinary reading הִרְרִיפָהוּ, where ר is without *Dageš*, is only intelligible if the ר has *Dageš*.

² Also in ψ 45¹⁰ read בִּיקְרוּתֶיךָ with Baer and Ginsburg, following Ben Asher, and in Pr 30¹⁷ לִיקָחַת (Ben Naphthali בִּיקֵּן and לִיקֵּן).

consonant cannot easily be sounded.¹ In such cases the preceding vowel is frequently lengthened (§ 27 *d*), e. g. רַב *multitude*, from רַבב; עַם *people*, with a distinctive accent or after the article, עַם, from עַמם; but e. g. גַּן *garden*, בַּת *daughter*, with the final consonant virtually sharpened. On the exceptions אַתָּה *thou* (fem.) and אַתָּה *thou* (fem.) *hast given* Ez 16³³, see § 10 *k*.

- m* (b) Very frequently in certain consonants with *Šewā mobile*, since the absence of a strong vowel causes the strengthening to be less noticeable. This occurs principally in the case of ו and י (on ו and י after the article, see § 35 *b*; on ו after מַה, § 37 *b*); and in the sonants מ,² נ and ל; also in the sibilants, especially when a guttural follows (but note Is 62⁹, מַאֲסָפִיו, as ed. Mant. and Ginsb. correctly read, while Baer has מַאֲסִי with compensatory lengthening, and others even מַאֲסִי; מִשְׁמָנִי Gn 27^{28,30}; מִשְׁלֵשׁ 38²⁴ for מִשֵּׁשׁ 1 K 7²⁸; מִשְׁפָּחָם 1 K 19²⁰ from מִשְׁחָם, Ez 40⁴³ and לְשַׁפְּנִים ψ 104¹⁸; מִשְׁתֵּי Jon 4¹¹, הַצְפִּירִים Ex 8¹ &c.);—and finally in the emphatic ק.³

Of the *Bēgadkēphath* letters, ב occurs without *Dageš* in מְבַצֵּר Ju 8²; ג in מְבַנְיָהם Ez 32³⁰; ד in נְדָחִי Is 11¹² 56⁸, ψ 147² (*not* in Jer 49⁵⁶), supposing that it is the Participle Niph'al of נָדַח; lastly, ה in תְּחַצֵּי Is 22¹⁰. Examples, וַיְהִי (so always the preformative ו in the *imperf.* of verbs), מְלַמְעֵלָה, מְלַמְנָח, הַנְּנִי, הַלְּלוּ, מְלֹא, כְּסֹא, יִשְׂאוּ, יִקְחוּ, יִקְחוּ, מְקַצֵּה, מְקַצֵּה, &c. In correct MSS. the omission of the *Dageš* is indicated by the *Rāphē* stroke (§ 14) over the consonant. However, in these cases, we must assume at least a *virtual* strengthening of the consonant (*Dageš forte implicitum*, see § 22 *c*, end).

(c) In the Gutturals, see § 22 *b*.

- n* Rem. 1. Contrary to rule the strengthening is omitted (especially in the later Books), owing to the lengthening of the preceding short vowel, generally *hireq* (cf. *mīle* for *mille*), e. g. יְהִיתֵן *he makes them afraid*, for יִהְיֶה Hb 2¹⁷ (where, however, it is perhaps more correct to suppose, with König, a formation on the analogy of verbs עָוִי, and moreover to read יְהִיתֵךְ with the LXX), יִקֹּת Is 50¹¹ for יִקֹּת.

- O* 2. Very doubtful are the instances in which compensation for the strengthening is supposed to be made by the insertion of a following נ. Thus for

¹ So in Latin *fel* (for *fell*), gen. *fellis*; *mel*, *mellis*; *os*, *ossis*. In Middle High German the doubling of consonants never takes place at the end of a word, but only in the middle (as in Old High German), e. g. *val* (*Fall*), gen. *valles*; *swam* (*Schwamm*), &c., Grimm, *Deutsche Gramm.*, 2nd ed., i. 383.

² *Dageš forte* is almost always omitted in מ when it is the prefix of the participle Pi'el or Pu'al, hence ψ 104³ הַמְקַרֵּה *who layeth the beams*, but הַמְקַרֵּה *the roof* Ec 10¹⁸ (cf. הַמְלַאכָה *the work*, &c.).

³ According to some also in ט in הַמְטִיעַ Is 17¹⁰; but see Baer on the passage.

מַעֲוִיָּה Is 23¹¹, read מַעֲוִיָּה (or מַעֲוִיָּה); and for תִּמְנוֹ La 3²², read תִּמְנוֹ. In Nu 23¹³ קָבְנוּ is not an instance of compensation (see § 67 o, end).

§ 21. *The Aspiration of the Tenuēs.*¹

The *harder* sound of the six *Bēgadkēphath* letters, indicated by *a Dageš lenē*, is to be regarded, according to the general analogy of languages, as their older and original pronunciation, from which the softer sound was weakened (§ 6 n and § 13). The original hard sound is maintained when the letter is initial, and after a consonant, but when it immediately follows a vowel or *Šewā mobile* it is softened and aspirated by their influence, e. g. פָּרַץ *pāraš*, יִפְרֹץ *yiphrōš*, כֹּל *kōl*, לֵחֹל *lekhol*. Hence the *Bēgadkēphath* take *Dageš lenē*

(1) at the beginning of words: (a) without exception when the *b* preceding word ends with a vowelless consonant, e. g. עַל-כֵּן *'al-kēn* (therefore), עֵץ פְּרִי *'ēš pērî* (fruit-tree); (b) at the beginning of a section, e. g. בְּרֵאשִׁית Gn 1¹, or at the beginning of a sentence, or even of a minor division of a sentence after a distinctive accent (§ 15 d), although the preceding word may end with a vowel. The distinctive accent in such a case prevents the vowel from influencing the following tenuis, e. g. וַיְהִי בְּאֵשֶׁר and it was so, that when, Ju 11⁵ (but וַיְהִי־כֵן Gn 1⁷).

Rem. 1. The vowel letters ה, ו, י, א, as such, naturally do not close a syllable. In close connexion they are therefore followed by the aspirated *Bēgadkēphath*, e. g. וּמִצָּא בָהּ, &c. On the other hand, syllables are closed by the consonantal ו and י (except קִרְתָּהּ Is 34¹¹; שָׁלוֹם Ez 23⁴²; אֲדֹנָי בָּם ψ 68¹⁸), and by ה with *Mappiq*; hence e. g. there is *Dageš lenē* in עָלַי פִּיהֶם and always after הִהוּה, since the *Qērē perpetuum* of this word (§ 17) assumes the reading אֲדֹנָי.

2. In a number of cases *Dageš lenē* is inserted, although a vowel precedes in *d* close connexion. This almost always occurs with the prefixes בַּ and בִּ in the combinations בַּב, בֵּב, בֶּב (i. e. when a *Bēgadkēphath* with *Šewā* precedes the same or a kindred aspirate) and בִּמ (see Baer, *L. Psalmorum*, 1880, p. 92,² on ψ 23³); cf. e. g. 1 S 25¹, Is 10⁹, ψ 34², Jb 19²; כֵּן is uncertain; כִּב, כֶּב, and כֵּב according to David Qimḥi do not take *Dageš*, nor כִּנ, כֶּב, and כֵּב according to the *Dikduke ha-t'amim*, p. 30. Sometimes the *Bēgadkēphath* letters, even with a full vowel, take *Dageš* before a spirant (and even before ה in בְּחִמְשָׁה 1 K 12³²); cf. the instances mentioned above, § 20 e (mostly tenuis before א). In all these cases the object is to prevent too great an accumulation of aspirates. The LXX, on the other hand, almost always represent the ב and

¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Ztschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1878, p. 585 ff.

² Also *L. Proverbiorum*, 1880, Praef. p. ix; and *Dikduke ha-t'amim*, p. 30 (in German in König's *Lehrgeb.*, i. p. 62).

ם, even at the beginning of a syllable, by χ and ϕ ; $\chi\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\upsilon\beta$, $\chi\alpha\lambda\delta\alpha\iota\upsilon$, $\Phi\alpha\rho\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho$, &c.—The forms בְּדָכָר (after וְשִׁמְתִּי) Is 54¹³, and בְּלִיל (after וְנִלְאִיתִי) Jer 20⁹ are doubly anomalous.

- e (2) In the middle of words after *Šewā quiescens*, i.e. at the beginning of a syllable immediately after a vowelless consonant,¹ e.g. יִרְפָּא *yirpā* (he heals), יֵהָרְגוּ *ye have killed*; but after *Šewā mobile*, e.g. רַפָּא *raphā* (heal thou), כְּבִדָּה *she was heavy*.

f On קָטַלְתָּ, וַיִּשָּׁב, and similar forms, see § 10 i.

Whether *Šewā* be vocal and consequently causes the aspiration of a following *tenuis*, depends upon the origin of the particular form. It is almost always vocal

(a) When it has arisen from the weakening of a strong vowel, e.g. רַפִּי *pursue ye* (not רָפִי) from רָרָה; מַלְכִּי (not מָלְכִי), because originally *mālākhē*, but מַלְכִּי from the ground-form *mark*.

(b) With the ך of the pronominal suffixes of the 2nd pers. ךְּ, ךֶּם, ךִּי, since *Šewā mobile* is characteristic of these forms (see § 58 f; § 91 b).

Rem. Forms like שְׁלַחְתָּ *thou* (fem.) *hast sent*, in which we should expect an aspirated ך after the vowel, cf. וַיַּחַדְךָ Ex 18⁹, have arisen from שְׁלַחְתָּ, יַחַדְךָ, &c.; Pathah being here simply a helping vowel has no influence on the tenuis; cf. § 28 e.

§ 22. *Peculiarities of the Gutturals.*

- a The four gutturals ה, ה, ע, א, in consequence of their peculiar pronunciation, have special characteristics, but א, as the weakest of these sounds, and sometimes also ע (which elsewhere as one of the harder gutturals is the opposite of א), differ in several respects from the stronger ה and ח.
- b 1. They do not admit of *Dageš forte*, since, in consequence of a gradual weakening of the pronunciation (see below, note 1), the strengthening of the gutturals was hardly audible to the Masoretes. But a distinction must be drawn between (a) the complete omission of the strengthening, and (b) the mere *echo* of it, commonly called *half doubling*, but better, *virtual strengthening*.
- c In the former case, the short vowel before the guttural would stand in an open syllable, and must accordingly be lengthened or modified.²

¹ The exceptions יִקְרָא Jos 15³⁸ (see *Minhat shay*, on this passage), 2 K 14⁷, and יִקְרָע Jos 15⁵⁶ may perhaps be due to the character of the ק.

² Cf. *terra* and the French *terre*, the German *Rolle* and the French *rôle*; German *drollig* and French *drôle*. The omission of the strengthening shows a deterioration of the language. Arabic still admits of the strengthening of gutturals in all cases.

For a distinction must again be drawn between the full lengthening of *Pathah* into *Qames*—mostly before א (always under the ה of the article, see § 35), as a rule also before ע, less frequently before ה, and least often before ח—and the modification of *Pathah* to *Seghol*, mostly before a guttural with *Qames*. In the other case (*virtual* strengthening) the *Dageš* is still omitted, but the strengthening is nevertheless regarded as having taken place, and the preceding vowel therefore remains short. This *virtual* strengthening occurs most frequently with ח, usually with ה, less frequently with ע, and very seldom with א. Examples of (a) מֵאֵן, הָאָדָם, הָעָם, הָהָר, יִהְיֶה (for *yihhābhē'*); also אֶחָד, הָחַג, הַהָרִים, הָעֵנִי (see more fully on the pointing of the article before ע in § 35).—Of (b) מְחֹרֵשׁ (from *minhūš*), הָהוּא, בָּעֵר, נֶאֱמַר, &c.—In all these cases of virtual strengthening the *Dageš forte* is to be regarded at least as implied (hence called *Dageš forte implicitum, occultum, or delitescens*).

2. They prefer before them, and sometimes after them (cf. *h*), *d* a short A-sound, because this vowel is organically the nearest akin to the gutturals. Hence

(a) before a guttural, *Pathah* readily (and always before ה, ח, ע closing a syllable) takes the place of another short vowel or of a rhythmically long ē or ō, e.g. יָבֵחַ *sacrifice*, not *zēbh*; יִשְׁמַע *report*, not *šēmē'*. This is more especially so when *a* was the original vowel of the form, or is otherwise admissible. Thus in the Imperat. and Imperf. Qal of guttural verbs, שְׁלַח *send thou*, יִשְׁלַח *he will send* (not *yīšlōh*); Perf. Pi'el שָׁלַח (but in Pausa שִׁלַּח); יִחְמֹד *he will desire* (not *yihmōd*); וַיָּנַח *and he rested* (not *wayyānōh*); יָעַר *a youth*. In שָׁלַח and יִחְמֹד *ā* is the original vowel.

Rem. In such cases as יָנַח, טָנָא, פָּלָא, פָּרָא, the א has no consonantal *e* value, and is only retained orthographically (see § 23 a).

(b) After a heterogeneous long vowel, i. e. after all except *Qames*, *f* the hard gutturals¹ (consequently not א), when standing at the end of the word, require the insertion of a rapidly uttered *ā* (*Pathah furtivum*) between themselves and the vowel. This *Pathah* is placed under the guttural, but sounded *before* it. It is thus merely an orthographic indication not to neglect the guttural sound in pronunciation, e.g. רוּחַ *rūāh*, נוֹעַ, רָע, הַשְׁלִיחַ, גְּבוּיָה (when consonantal ה is

¹ Prätorius, *Ueber den rückweich. Accent im Hebr.*, Halle, 1897, p. 17, &c., remarks that *Pathah furtivum* has not arisen merely under the influence of the guttural, but is due to a duplication of the accented syllable, so that e.g. יָשִׁיב, יָצִיר would also be pronounced *yasi'bh*, *yasū'dh* although the short intermediate vowel was not so noticeable as before a guttural.

final it necessarily takes Mappiq), but e.g. רֹחִי, &c., since here the rapidly uttered *ā* is no longer heard.

g *I*^{ch} for *ich*, &c., in some Swiss dialects of German, is analogous; a *furtive Pathah* is here involuntarily intruded before the deep guttural sound. In Arabic the same may be heard in such words as *mesiah*, although it is not expressed in writing. The LXX (and Jerome, cf. ZAW. iv. 79) write *ε*, sometimes *α*, instead of *furtive Pathah*, e.g. נַח Nāε, נָדוּעַ 'Ieððouα (also 'Iaððou).

h Rem. 1. The guttural may also have an influence upon the following vowel, especially in Segholate forms, e.g. נָעַר (not na'ēr) a youth, פָּעַל (not pō'el) deed. The only exceptions are אָהַל, בָּהֵן, לָחַם, רָחַם.

i 2. Where in the present form of the language an *ī*, whether original or attenuated from *Pathah*, would stand before or after a guttural in the first syllable of a word, a *S'ghōl* as being between *ā* and *ī* is frequently used instead, e.g. יַחֲבֹשׁ (also יַחֲבֹשׁ), יַהֲנֹחַ, חֲבָלִי, חֲבָדִי, עֲוֹרִי, &c.

k On the other hand, the slighter and sharper *Hireq* is retained even under gutturals when the following consonant is sharpened by *Dageš forte*, e.g. הִלָּל, הִנָּח, הִפָּח; but when this sharpening is removed, *S'ghōl* is again apt to appear, e.g. הִנּוּן constr. הִנּוּן, הִפּוּן constr. הִפּוּן.

l 3. Instead of simple *Š'wā* mobile, the gutturals take without exception a compound *Š'wā*, e.g. אָמַר, אָמַרְתִּי, אָמַרְתָּ, &c.

m 4. When a guttural with *quiescent Š'wā* happens to close a syllable in the middle of a word, the strongly closed syllable (with *quiescent Š'wā*) may remain; necessarily so with ח, ע, and ה at the end of the tone-syllable, e.g. שָׁלַחַת, יָדַעַת, but also before the tone (see examples under *i*), even with א.

But in the syllable before the tone and further back, the closed syllable is generally opened artificially by a *Hateph* (as being suited to the guttural) taking the place of the *quiescent Š'wā*, and in particular that *Hateph* which repeats the sound of the preceding vowel, e.g. יַחֲשֹׁב (also יַחֲשֹׁב); יַחֲזֹק (also יַחֲזֹק); פָּעֵלָּו pō'elō (for pō'elō). But when, owing to a flexional change, the strong vowel following the *Hateph* is weakened into *Š'wā* mobile, then instead of the *Hateph* its full vowel is written, e.g. יַעֲמֹד (from יַעֲמֹד), נַעֲרָמָה (from נַעֲרָמָה). The original forms, according to § 28 c, were ya'm^edhā, ne'r^emā, pō'el^ekhā. Hence יַעֲמֹד, &c., are really only different orthographic forms of יַעֲמֹד, &c., and would be better transcribed by ya'a^medhā, &c.

n Rem. 1. On the use of simple or compound *Š'wā* in guttural verbs, see further §§ 62-65.

o 2. Respecting the choice between the three *Hatephs*, it may be remarked:
(a) ח, ה, ע at the beginning of a syllable prefer *—*, but א prefers *—*, e.g. חָמַר ass, הָרַג to kill, אָמַר to say; when farther from the tone syllable, however, the *—* even under א changes into the lighter *—*, e.g. אָלִי (poetic for אֵלִי) to, but אֵלֶיכֶם to you, אָכַל to eat, but אָכְלָה (a'khōl, toneless on account

of Maqqēph). Cf. § 27 w. The 1st pers. sing. imperf. Pi'el regularly has ִּ. Likewise ִּ is naturally found under ◌ in cases where the *Ḥateph* arises from a weakening of an original *ā* (e.g. לִּיִּן lion, ground-form 'ary), and ִּ if there be a weakening of an original *u* (e.g. לִּיִּן a fleet, לִּיִּן affliction, cf. § 93 g, z).

(b) In the middle of a word after a long vowel, a *Ḥateph-Pathah* takes the place of a simple *Šwā mobile*, e.g. הֵעֵלָהּ (see § 63 p); but if a short vowel precedes, the choice of the *Ḥateph* is generally regulated by it, e.g. *Perf. Hiph.* הֵעֵמִיד (see above, i), *Infin.* הֵעֵמִיד (regular form הֵקֵמִיל); *Perf. Hoph.* הֵעֵמִיד (regular form הֵקֵמִיל); but cf. שָׁחַדוּ Jb 6²² (§ 64 a).

5. The ר, which in sound approximates to the gutturals (§ 6 c), shares with the gutturals proper their first, and to a certain extent their second, peculiarity, viz.

(a) The exclusion of the strengthening, instead of which the preceding vowel is almost always lengthened, e.g. בֵּרַךְ he has blessed for *birraḥh*, בִּרְךָ to bless for *barrēkh*.

(b) The preference for *ā* as a preceding vowel, e.g. וַיֵּרָא and he saw *r* (from וַיֵּרָא); וַיָּסֹר both for וַיָּסֹר and he turned back, and for וַיָּסֹר and he caused to turn back.

The exceptions to *a* are מֹרְרָת *mōrrāth*, Pr 14¹⁰; כְּהֹרְרָת *khōrrāth* and שֹׁרְרֵכְךָ *šōrrēkh*, S Ez 16⁴ (cf. Pr 3⁸); נִשְׂרָאֵשִׁי Ct 5²; הִרְעַמָּה 1 S 16⁶; הִרְאִיתָם 1 S 10²⁴, 17²⁵, 2 K 6³²; הִדְרִיפָהוּ Ju 20⁴³ (cf. § 20 h); מִרְדָּף 1 S 23²⁸, 2 S 18¹⁶; also on account of דְּחִיק (§ 20 c) Jer 22²², Pr 15¹, 20²², 2 Ch 26¹⁰; and on account of מִרְחִיק (§ 20 f) 1 S 15⁶, Jer 39¹², Hb 3¹³, Pr 11²¹, Jb 39⁹, Ez 9⁶. A kind of virtual strengthening (after מִ for מִן) is found in מִרְנֹנֶךָ Is 14³. In Samaritan and Arabic this strengthening has been retained throughout, and the LXX write e.g. *Σάππα* for שָׁרָה.

§ 23. *The Feebleness of the Gutturals* א and ה.

1. The א, a light and scarcely audible guttural breathing, as a rule *a* entirely loses its slight consonantal power whenever it stands without a vowel at the end of a syllable. It then remains (like the German *h* in *roh*, *geh*, *nahte*) merely as a sign of the preceding long vowel, e.g. מִצָּה, מִלָּה, הוֹצִיא (but when a syllable is added with an introductory vowel, according to *b* below, we have, e.g. הוֹצִיאֲנִי, מִצָּאֲנִי, since the א then stands at the beginning of the syllable, not מִצָּאֲנִי, הוֹצִיאֲנִי), מִצָּה, פָּלִיא (cf., however, § 74 a), מִצָּאֲתָ (for *māṣa'tā*, תִּמְצָאֲנָה). Similarly in cases like הִטָּא, וַיֵּרָא, שָׂא, &c. (§ 19. I), and even in רָשָׁא, פָּלָא (see above, § 22 e), the א only retains an orthographic significance.

2. On the other hand, א is in general retained as a strong consonant whenever it begins a syllable, e.g. אָמַר, מָאֲסוּ, or when it is protected by a *Ḥateph* after a short syllable, e.g. לֹאֲכַל, and finally,

when it stands in a closed syllable with quiescent *Šewā* after a preceding *Šeghōl* or *Pathah*, e.g. נָאָדָר וְנָאָסָר *nā'dār, ya'dimā*. Even in such cases the consonantal power of *Ṣ* may be entirely lost, viz.

c (a) when it would stand with a long vowel in the middle of a word after *Šewā mobile*. The long vowel is then occasionally thrown back into the place of the *Šewā*, and the *Ṣ* is only retained orthographically, as an indication of the etymology, e.g. ראשִׁים *heads* (for *re'āšīm*), מֵאֵתִים *two hundred* (for *mē'āthāyim*), שָׁאֵטָה Ez 25⁶ for שָׁאֵטָה Neh 6⁸ for בּוֹדָם; מָאוֹם Jb 31⁷, Dn 1⁴ for מָאוֹם; פֶּאֶרָה for פֶּאֶרָה Is 10³³; חֲטָאִים *hōtīm*, 1 S 14³³ for חֲטָאִים (cf. § 74 *h*, and § 75 *oo*); חֲרָאוֹבֵי Nu 34¹⁴, from חֲרָאוֹבֵי; so always חֲטָאֹת or חֲטָאוֹת 1 K 14¹⁶, Mi 1⁵, &c., for חֲטָאוֹת. Sometimes a still more violent suppression of the *Ṣ* occurs at the beginning of a syllable, which then causes a further change in the preceding syllable, e.g. מְלָאכָה *work* for מְלָאכָה (as in the Babylonian punctuation), יִשְׁמְעָאֵל for יִשְׁמְעָאֵל or שְׁמָאוֹל *the left hand*, ground form *sim'al*.

d (b) When it originally closed a syllable. In these cases *Ṣ* is generally (by § 22 *m*) pronounced with a *Hateph*, *ḥ* or *ḥ*. The preceding short vowel is, however, sometimes lengthened and retains the following *Ṣ* only orthographically, e.g. וְנִאֲצֵל Nu 11²⁵ for וְנִאֲצֵל (cf. Ju 9⁴¹), and פֶּאֶרָה Jo 2⁶ for פֶּאֶרָה; לֵאמֹר for לֵאמֹר; לֵאמֹר for לֵאמֹר; but the contraction does not take place in לֵאמֹר Is 10¹¹. The short vowel is retained, although the consonantal power of *Ṣ* is entirely lost, in וְנִאֲצֵל, &c. (see § 102 *m*), וְנִאֲצֵל Is 41²⁵, וְנִאֲצֵל Ez 28¹⁶ for וְנִאֲצֵל; cf. Dt 24¹⁰, 1 K 11³⁹, Is 10¹³.

e Instead of this *Ṣ* which has lost its consonantal value, one of the vowel letters *ו* and *י* is often written according to the nature of the sound, the former with *ō* and the latter with *ē* and *i*, e.g. בּוֹדָם *buffalo* for בּוֹדָם. At the end of the word ה also is written for *Ṣ*, יִמְלֵה *he fills* for יִמְלֵה Jb 8²¹ (see below, *l*).

f 3. When *Ṣ* is only preserved orthographically or as an indication of the etymology (quiescent), it is sometimes entirely dropped (cf. § 19 *k*), e.g. יִצְחָי Jb 1²¹ for יִצְחָי; מְלִיחָי Jb 32¹⁸ for מְלִיחָי; מְצָחַי Nu 11¹¹; וְתִהְיֶה 2 S 20⁹; וְיִרְפֶּי Jer 8¹¹ for וְיִרְפֶּי; וְיִרְפֶּי 2 S 22⁴⁰, but וְיִרְפֶּי ψ 18⁴⁰; תּוֹמָם Gn 25²⁴ for תּוֹמָם; אֲחֻזָּה 3 I³⁹ for אֲחֻזָּה; שְׁלֹחַ 1 S 1¹⁷ for שְׁלֹחַ; שְׁאֵלָה ψ 22²² for שְׁאֵלָה; נֹחַ Jb 22²⁹ for נֹחַ; חֲבֵרָה 1 Ch 11³⁹ for חֲבֵרָה, and so שְׁרִית 1 Ch 12³⁸ for שְׁרִית; לְהִשְׁאוֹת 2 K 19²⁵ *Kethibh* for לְהִשְׁאוֹת (cf. Is 37²⁶); חֲמָה Jb 29⁶ for חֲמָה. In מְפֻלָּת

¹ In Jer 22²³, נִחְנָת is unquestionably a corruption of נִחְנָת for נִחְנָת.

1 K 5²⁵ (for "מַצֵּב") the strengthening of the following consonant by Dageš compensates for the loss of the א; in מַסְרֵת Ez 20³⁷, if for "מַצֵּב" (but read מוֹסֵר, with Cornill), the preceding vowel is lengthened; cf. above, c. On אֶמֶר for אָמַר, see § 68 g.

Rem. 1. In Aramaic the א is much weaker and more liable to change than ^g in Hebrew. In literary Arabic, on the other hand, it is almost always a firm consonant. According to Arabic orthography, א serves also to indicate a long *a*, whereas in Hebrew it very rarely occurs as a mere vowel letter after Qameṣ; as in קָאם Ho 10¹⁴ for קָם *he rose up*; רָאשׁ Pr 10⁴, 13²³ for רָשׁ *poor*; but in 2 S 11¹ the *Kethibh* הַמִּלְאִים *the messengers*, is the true reading; cf. § 7 b.

2. In some cases at the beginning of a word, the א, instead of a compound ^h Šewā, takes the corresponding full vowel, e.g. אָוֹר *girale* for אֹוֹר; cf. § 84 a, q, and the analogous cases in § 52 n, § 63 p, § 76 d, § 93 r (אֶהְיֶה).

3. An א is sometimes added at the end of the word to a final *u*, *i*, or *o*, e.g. ⁱ הַלְכוּ for הִלְכוּ Jo 10²⁴ (before א!), אָבִיא Is 28¹². These examples, however, are not so much instances of 'Arabic orthography', as early scribal errors, as in יִנְשְׂאוּ Je 10⁵ for יִנְשְׂאוּ; and in נִשְׂאוּ ψ 139²⁰ for נִשְׂאוּ. Cf. also יהוּא Ec 11³ (§ 75 s); נָקִיא for נָקִי *pure*; לוֹא for לוֹ *if*; אָפֹא for אָפוּ *then (enclitic)*; רְבוּא for רְבוּ *myriad*, Neh 7^{66.72}. On הוּא and הִיא see § 32 k.

4. The ה is stronger and firmer than the א, and never loses its ^k consonantal sound (i.e. *quiesces*) in the middle of a word¹ except in the cases noted below, in which it is completely elided by syncope. On the other hand, at the end of a word it is always a mere vowel letter, unless expressly marked by *Mappiq* as a strong consonant (§ 14 a). Yet at times the consonantal sound of ה at the end of a word is lost, and its place is taken by a simple ה or more correctly \bar{h} , with *Rāphè* as an indication of its non-consonantal character, e.g. לָהָה *to her* for לָהֶה, Zc 5¹¹, &c. (cf. § 103 g, and §§ 58 g, 91 e); cf. also יָהֶה for יָהֵה (from יָהִי) in proper names like יִרְמְיָהּ, &c.—Finally, in very many cases a complete elision of the consonantal ה takes place by *syncope*: (a) when its vowel is thrown back to the place of a preceding Šewā mobile (see above, c, with א), e.g. לְהַפְקֵר for לְהַפְקֵר (the ה of the article being syncopated as it almost always is); בְּהִיּוֹם for בְּהִיּוֹם [but see § 35 n], בְּהַשְׁמִים for בְּהַשְׁמִים; יְהִנֵּנָה for יְהִנֵּנָה; perhaps also בְּנִיָּהֶם for בְּנִיָּהֶם Ez 27³². (b) By contraction of the vowels preceding and following the ה, e.g. סִסְחֻ (also written סִסְחָה) from *sūsahu* (*a + u = o*).—A violent suppression of ה together with its vowel occurs in בָּם (from בָּהֶם), &c.

¹ Only apparent exceptions are such *proper names* as עֶשְׂהָאֵל, פְּרָהֶצוֹר, which are compounded of two words and hence are sometimes even divided. Cf. forms like הוּאֵל for הוּאֵל. Another exception is יִפְהַפְיָה, the reading of many MSS. for the artificially divided form יִפְהַפְיָה in the printed texts, Je 46²⁰.

l Rem. In connexion with δ and ϵ , a η which only marks the vowel ending is occasionally changed into \imath or י ($\text{רָאָה} = \text{רָאָה}$, $\text{חָכֵי} = \text{חָכֵה}$ Ho 6⁹), and with any vowel into \aleph in the later or Aramaic orthography, but especially with \bar{a} , e. g. שָׁנָא *sleep*, ψ יִשְׁנָה for יִשְׁנָה ; נִשְׂאָ Jer 23³⁹ for נִשְׂאָה , &c. Thus it is evident that final η as a vowel letter has only an orthographical importance.

§ 24. *Changes of the Weak Letters \imath and י .*

Philippi, *Die Aussprache der semit. Konsonanten* \imath und י (mentioned above, § 5 b, note 1), a thorough investigation of their phonetic value as consonantal, i. e. non-syllabic, vowel-sounds, not palatal or labial fricatives; cf. also E. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 15.

a \imath and י are, as consonants, so weak, and approach so nearly to the corresponding vowels u and i , that under certain conditions they very readily merge into them. This fact is especially important in the formation of those weak stems, in which a \imath or י occurs as one of the three radical consonants (§ 69 ff., § 85, § 93).

1. The cases in which \imath and י lose their consonantal power, i. e. merge into a vowel, belong almost exclusively to the middle and end of words; at the beginning they remain as consonants.¹

The instances may be classified under two heads:

b (a) When either \imath or י with *quiescent* $\check{S}ewá$ stands at the end of a syllable immediately after a *homogeneous* vowel (u or i). It then merges in the homogeneous vowel, or more accurately it assumes its vowel-character (\imath as u , י as i), and is then contracted with the preceding vowel into *one* vowel, necessarily long, but is mostly retained orthographically as a (quiescent) vowel letter. Thus הוּשָׁב for *huwšab*; יִיְיָ for *yiyqas*; so also at the end of the word, e. g. עֲבָרִי a *Hebrew*, properly *‘ibrîy*, fem. עֲבָרִיָּה , pl. עֲבָרִיִּים (and עֲבָרִים); עָשָׂי Jb 41²⁵ for *‘ušîy* (cf. עֲשׂוּת 1 S 25¹⁵ *Kethîbh*). On the other hand, if the preceding vowel be heterogeneous, \imath and י are retained as full consonants (on the pronunciation see § 8 m), e. g. שָׁלֵו *quiet*, וַי *the month of May*, גּוֹי *nation*, גָּלִי *revealed*. But with a preceding \bar{a} the \imath and י are mostly contracted into δ and \hat{e} (see below, *f*), and at the end of a word they are sometimes rejected (see below, *g*).

Complete syncope of \imath before \hat{e} occurs in אִיְלָה *island* for אִיְלָה ; עִיר *ruins* for עִיר ; רִי *watering* Jb 37¹¹ for רִי ; בִּר *burning* Is 3²⁴ for בִּר , cf. §§ 84^a c, e, 93 y).

¹ Or as consonantal vowels (see above), and are then transcribed by P. Haupt, Philippi, and others, as u , i , following the practice of Indogermanic philologists. \imath for י and, alone is a standing exception, see § 26. 1 and § 104 e. On $\text{י} = i$ at the beginning of a word, cf. § 47 b, note. According to § 19 a, end, *initial* \imath in Hebrew almost always becomes י ; always in verbs originally פִּי , § 69 a. Apart from a few proper names, *initial* \imath occurs only in וַי *hook*, וַי *child* Gn 11³⁰, 2 S 6²³ *Kethîbh* [elsewhere וַי], and the doubtful וַי Pr 21⁸.

Thus an initial י after the prefixes בּ, ל, כּ, ו, which would then be *c* pronounced with *i* (see § 28 a), and also almost always after מ (see § 102 b), coalesces with the *i* to *ê*, e.g. בְּיְהוּדָה in *Judah* (for בְּיָ), וְיְהוּדָה and *Judah*, בְּיֶאֱר as the *Nile*, לְיְהוּדָה for *Judah*, מִיְּדֵי from the hands of.

(b) When ו and י without a vowel would stand at the end of the *d* word after quiescent *Šewâ*, they are either wholly rejected and only orthographically replaced by ה (e.g. בִּכְיָה from *bikhy*, as well as the regularly formed בְּכִי weeping; cf. § 93 x) or become again vowel letters. In the latter case י becomes a homogeneous *Hireq*, and also attracts to itself the tone, whilst the preceding vowel becomes *Šewâ* (e.g. פִּירִי from *piry*, properly *pariy*); ו is changed sometimes into a toneless *u* (e.g. תוּחֻו from *tuhw*).

Rem. In Syriac, where the weak letters more readily become vowel sounds, *e* a simple *i* may stand even at the beginning of words instead of י or י. The LXX also, in accordance with this, write 'Ioudā for יְהוּדָה, 'Isaak for יִצְחָק. Hence may be explained the Syriac usage in Hebrew of drawing back the vowel *i* to the preceding consonant, which properly had a simple vocal *Šewâ*, e.g. (according to the reading of Ben-Naphtali ¹) וַיִּלְלֵת Jer 25³⁶ for וַיִּלְלֵת (so Baer), בְּיִתְרוֹן Ec 2¹³ for בְּיִתְרוֹן, cf. also the examples in § 20 h, note 2; even וַיִּחַלְו Jb 29²¹ (in some editions) for וַיִּחַלְו. According to Qimḥi (see § 47 b) יִקְטֹל was pronounced as *iqṭōl*, and therefore the 1st pers. was pointed יִקְטֹל to avoid confusion. In fact the Babylonian punctuation always has *i* for *ā* in the 1st pers.

2. With regard to the choice of the long vowel, in which ו and י *f* quiesce after such vocalization and contraction, the following rules may be laid down:

(a) With a short homogeneous vowel ו and י are contracted into the corresponding long vowel (*û* or *î*), see above, b.

(b) With short *ă* they form the diphthongs *ô* and *ê* according to § 7 a, e.g. מִיִּטִּיב from מִיִּטִּיב; יוֹשִׁיב from יוֹשִׁיב, &c.²

Rem. The rejection of the half vowels ו and י (see above, b) occurs especially *g* at the end of words after a heterogeneous vowel (*ă*), if according to the nature of the form the contraction appears impossible. So especially in

¹ According to Abulwalid, Ben-Naphtali regarded the *Yodh* in all such cases as a vowel letter.

² Instances in which no contraction takes place after *ă* are, מִיִּמִּינִים I Ch 12²; אִיִּסְרִים Ho 7¹² (but cf. § 70 b); הַיִּשָּׂר ψ 59 *Qerê*; the locatives בְּיִתָּה, מִצְרֵימָה, &c.—On the suffix יִכִּי for יָךְ see § 91 l.—Sometimes both forms are found, as עוֹלָה and עוֹלָה; cf. חַי living, constr. חַי. Analogous is the contraction of מוֹת (ground-form *mawt*) death, constr. מוֹת; עֵינַי (ground-form 'ayn ['ain]) eye, constr. עֵינַי.

verbs ה"ל, e.g. originally הַלֵּל = (י)הַלֵּל = הַלֵּל, since *ā* after the rejection of the י stands in an open syllable, and consequently must be lengthened to *ā*. The ה is simply an orthographic sign of the long vowel. So also שָׁלַח for šālaw.¹ On the origin of יִהְיֶה, see § 75 e; on קָם as perf. and part. of קָם, see § 72 b and g; on יִלֵּךְ, &c., from וָלַךְ, see § 69 b.—On the weakening of ו and י to נ, see § 93 x.

§ 25. Unchangeable Vowels.

a What vowels in Hebrew are unchangeable, i.e. are not liable to attenuation (to Šewā), modification, lengthening, or shortening, can be known with certainty only from the nature of the grammatical forms, and in some cases by comparison with Arabic (cf. § 1 m). This holds good especially of the *essentially* long vowels, i.e. those long by *nature* or *contraction*, as distinguished from those which are only lengthened *rhythmically*, i.e. on account of the special laws which in Hebrew regulate the tone and the formation of syllables. The latter, when a change takes place in the position of the tone or in the division of syllables, readily become short again, or are reduced to a mere vocal Šewā.

b 1. The essentially long and consequently, as a rule (but cf. § 26 p, § 27 n, o), unchangeable vowels of the *second* and *third* class, *i*, *e*, *u*, *o*, can often be recognized by means of the vowel letters which accompany them (יִ, יֵ, יוּ, וּ); e.g. יַיִטִּיב *he does well*, הַיְכָל *palace*, גְּבוּל *boundary*, קוֹל *voice*. The *defective* writing (§ 8 i) is indeed common enough, e.g. יִטֵּב and יִטִּיב for יַיִטִּיב; גָּבַל for גְּבוּל; קָל for קוֹל, but this is merely an orthographic licence and has no influence on the quantity of the vowel; the *u* in גָּבַל is just as necessarily long, as in גְּבוּל.

As an exception, a merely tone-long vowel of both these classes is sometimes written *fully*, e.g. יִקְטֹל for יִקְטַל.

c 2. The essentially or naturally long *ā* (*Qameṣ impure*),² unless it has become *ō* (cf. § 9 q), has as a rule in Hebrew no representative among the consonants, while in Arabic it is regularly indicated by נ; on the few instances of this kind in Hebrew, cf. § 9 b, § 23 g. The naturally long *ā* and the merely tone-long *ā* therefore can only be distinguished by an accurate knowledge of the forms.

¹ The Arabic, in such cases, often writes etymologically هَلَّلَ, but pronounces galā. So the LXX סִינִי Σινᾱ, Vulg. Sina; cf. Nestle, ZAW. 1905, p. 362 f. But even in Arabic سَلَا is written for سَلَّى and pronounced salā.

² By *vocales impurae* the older grammarians meant vowels properly followed by a vowel letter. Thus כְּתָבָה kethābh was regarded as merely by a licence for כְּתָבָה, &c.

3. Short vowels in closed syllables (§ 26 b), which are not final, are *d* as a rule unchangeable, e. g. מַלְבוּשׁ *garment*, מִדְבָּר *wilderness*, מַמְלָכָה *kingdom*; similarly, short vowels in sharpened syllables, i. e. before *Dageš forte*, e. g. נֶגֶב *thief*.

4. Finally, those long vowels are unchangeable which, owing to *c* the omission of the strengthening in a guttural or ר, have arisen by lengthening from the corresponding short vowels, and now stand in an open syllable, e. g. מֵאָן for *mā'en*; בִּרְךָ for *burrah*.

§ 26. Syllable-formation¹ and its Influence on the Quantity of Vowels.

Apart from the unchangeable vowels (§ 25), the use of short or long *a* vowels, i. e. their lengthening, shortening, or change into vocal *Šewā*, depends on the *theory of syllable-formation*. The initial and final syllables especially require consideration.

1. The *initial* syllable. A syllable regularly begins with a consonant, or, in the case of initial ו and י (cf. note on § 5 b), a consonantal vowel.² The copula is a standing exception to this rule. According to the Tiberian pronunciation ו and is resolved into the corresponding vowel ו before *Šewā*, and the labials, e. g. וִירָבָר, וִירָבָר; the Babylonian punctuation in the latter cases writes ו, i. e. ו before a full vowel.

2. The *final* syllable. A syllable may end—

(a) With a vowel, and is then called an *open* or *simple* syllable, e. g. in קָטִיל where the first and last are open. See below, *e*.

(b) With *one* consonant, and is then called a *simple closed* or *compound* syllable, as the second in קָטִיל, לֵב, קָטִיל. See below, *o*, *p*. Such are also the syllables ending in a strengthened consonant, as the first in קָטִיל *qat-tēl*. See below, *q*.

(c) With *two* consonants, a *doubly closed* syllable, as קָטִיל קָטִיל. *d* Cf. below, *r*, and § 10 i-l.

3. *Open* or *simple* syllables have a long vowel, whether they have *e* the tone as in בָּרָךְ *in thee*, הֵלֵךְ *he goes*, or are toneless as in קָטִיל, עֵבֶר *a bunch of grapes*.³ A long vowel (*Qames*, less frequently *Sere*) is

¹ Cf. C. H. Toy, 'The Syllable in Hebrew,' *Amer. Journal of Philol.*, 1884, p. 494 ff.; H. Strack, 'The Syllables in the Hebrew Language,' *Hebraica*, Oct. 1884, p. 73 ff.

² We are not taking account here of the few cases in which initial *Yodh* is represented as simple *i*, by being written י or י, see § 24 e, and especially § 47 b, note; nor of certain other cases in which י with an initial vowel has only a graphic purpose, though it is indispensable in an unpointed text.

³ In opposition to this fundamental law in Hebrew (a long vowel in an *open* syllable), the original short vowel is found always in Arabic, and sometimes

especially common in an open syllable before the tone (pretonic vowel), e. g. *לָהֶם*, *יָקִים*, *קָטַל*, *לָבַב*.¹

Short vowels in open syllables occur:

f (a) In apparently dissyllabic words formed by means of a helping vowel from monosyllables, as *נָחַל* brook, *בַּיִת* house, *יָרַב* let him increase, from *naḥl*, *bayt*, *yirb*; cf. also *יָם* the ending of the dual (§ 88). But see § 28 e.

g (b) In the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing. (*נִי* me), e. g. *קָטַלְנִי* (Arab. *qātālānī*). The uncommon form *נִי*, however (Gn 30^e, cf. § 59*f*), proves that the tone-bearing *Pathah* produces a sharpening of the following sonant, and thus virtually stands in a closed syllable, even when the *Nun* is not expressly written with *Dageš*. In cases like *וְאֶדְנִי* (§ 102, end) *Pathah* is retained in the counter-tone after the *N* has become quiescent.

h (c) Sometimes before the toneless *ה־* local (§ 90 c), e. g. *מִדְבָּרָה* towards the wilderness; only, however, in the constr. state (1 K 19¹⁵), since the toneless suffix *ה־* does not affect the character of the form (especially when rapidly pronounced in close connexion); otherwise it is *מִדְבָּרָה*.

In all these cases the short vowel is also supported by the tone, either the principal tone of the word, or (as in *h*) by the secondary tone in the constr. st., or by the counter-tone with *Metheg*, as in *וְאֶדְנִי* above, *g*; cf. the effect of the *arsis* on the short vowel in classical prosody.

i (d) In the combinations *נַעַר*, *נַעֲרָה*, *נַעֲרָה*, *נַעֲרָה*, e. g. *נַעַר* his boy, *נַעֲרָה* he will bind, *נַעֲרָה* his deed. In all these cases the syllable was at first really closed, and it was only when the guttural took a *Haṭeph* that it became in consequence open (but cf. e. g. *נַעֲרָה* and *נַעֲרָה*). The same vowel sequence arises wherever a preposition *בְּ*, *כִּי*, *לְ*, or *וְ* copulative is prefixed to an initial syllable which has a *Haṭeph*, since the former then takes the vowel

in the other Semitic languages, except of course in the case of naturally long vowels. The above examples are pronounced in Arabic *bikā*, *qātālā*, *ʿināb*. Although it is certain therefore that in Hebrew also, at an earlier period, short vowels were pronounced in open syllables, it may still be doubted whether the present pronunciation is due merely to an artificial practice followed in the solemn recitation of the O. T. text. On this hypothesis we should have still to explain, e. g. the undoubtedly very old lengthening of *i* and *u* in an open syllable into *ē* and *ō*.

¹ That these pretonic vowels are really long is shown by Brockelmann, Z. A. xiv. 343 f., from the transcription of Hebrew proper names in the Nestorian (Syriac) punctuation, and e. g. from the Arabic 'Ibrāhīm = *إِبْرَاهِيمَ*. He regards their lengthening in the syllable before the tone as a means adopted by the Masoretes to preserve the pronunciation of the traditional vowels. This explanation of the pretonic vowels as due to a precaution against their disappearing, is certainly right; as to whether the precaution can be ascribed to the Masoretes, see the previous note. For the pretonic vowel the Arabic regularly has a short vowel (*lāḥūm*, *yāqūm*, &c.), the Aramaic simply a vocal *šewā* (*לָהֶם*, *יָקִים*, *קָטַל*, *לָבַב*); and even in Hebrew, when the tone is thrown forward the pretonic vowel almost always becomes *šewā*, see § 27. It would, however, be incorrect to assume from this that the pretonic vowel has taken the place of *šewā* only on account of the following tone-syllable. It always arises from an original short vowel, since such a vowel is mostly lengthened in an open syllable before the tone, but when the tone is moved forward it becomes *šewā*.

contained in the *Ha'eph* (see § 102 *d* and § 104 *d*). To the same category belong also the cases where these prepositions with Hired stand before a consonant with simple Šewâ mobile, e.g. בְּרִבְרִי, בְּרִבְרִי, &c.

(e) In forms like יְחִיזִקוּ yāhū-šē-qū (they are strong), פָּעִלְךָ pō'ē l'khā (thy deed). These again are cases of the subsequent opening of closed syllables (hence, e.g. יְחִיזִקוּ also occurs); פָּעִלְךָ is properly pō'ē l'khā; cf. generally § 22 *m*, end, and § 28 *c*.

Such cases as הַחֲרָשׁ, הָחִים (§ 96), הַחֲתָת (§ 67 *w*) do not come under this *l* head, since they all have *ā* in a virtually sharpened syllable; nor does the tone-bearing *Seghōl* in suffixes (e.g. בְּרִבְרִי), and other cases, nor *Seghōl* for *ā* before a guttural with *Qames* (§ 22 *c*). On יִשְׂרָאֵל and קִרְיָשִׁים, see § 9 *v*.

4. The independent syllables with a firm vowel which have been *m* described above, are frequently preceded by a single consonant with vocal Šewâ, simple or compound. Such a consonant with vocal Šewâ never has the value of an independent syllable, but rather attaches itself so closely to the following syllable that it forms practically one syllable with it, e.g. לְחִי (cheek) l'chi; חֲלִי (sickness) h'li; יִלְמְדוּ yil-m'dhū. This concerns especially the prefixes לְ, בְּ, בְּ, לְ. See § 102.

The Šewâ mobile is no doubt in all such cases weakened from an original *n* full vowel (e.g. יַקְטִילוּ Arab. yaqtūlū, בִּקְיָ Arab. bikā, &c.); from this, however, it cannot be inferred that the Masoretes regarded it as forming a kind of open syllable, for this would be even more directly opposed to their fundamental law (viz. that a long vowel should stand in an open syllable), than are the exceptions cited above, *f-k*. Even the use of Metheg with Šewâ in special cases (see § 16 *f*) is no proof of such a view on the part of the Masoretes.

5. Closed syllables ending with one consonant, when without the *o* tone, necessarily have short vowels, whether at the beginning or at the end of words,¹ e.g. מַלְכָּה queen, חִשְׁבוֹן understanding, חֲכָמָה wisdom, וַיָּסֹר and he turned back, וַיָּקֶם, וַיָּקֶם (wayyāqōm).

A tone-bearing closed syllable may have either a long or short vowel, *p* but if the latter, it must as a rule be either Pathah or Seghōl.² The tone-bearing closed penultima admits, of the long vowels, only the tone-long *ā*, *ē*, *ō*, not the longest *ī*, *ē*, *ō*, *ū*; of the short vowels, only *ā*, *ē*, not *ī*, *ū*, *ō* (but on *ī* and *ū*, see § 29 *g*). Thus יַקְטִילוּ (3rd pl. masc. Imperf. Hiph.) but חֲקַטְלָנָה 3rd pl. fem., and קִרְמוּ (2nd pl. masc. Imperat. Qal) but קִרְמָה fem.

¹ In exceptions such as שְׁתִּילִי Gn 4²⁵ (where šat is required by the character of the form, although the closed syllable has lost the tone owing to the following Maqqeph), Metheg is used to guard against a wrong pronunciation; similarly *ē* is sometimes retained before Maqqeph, e.g. שָׁם Gn 2¹³; עַיִן Gn 2¹⁶.

² See § 9 *e, f*. *ī* occurs thus only in the particles אֵם, עֵם, מֵן; but these usually (מֵן always) are rendered toneless by a following Maqqeph. Cf. also such forms as וַיִּשְׁבֵּב § 26 *r* and § 75 *q*.

q 6. A special kind of closed syllables are the *sharpened*, i. e. those which end in the same (strengthened) consonant with which the following syllable begins, e. g. אִמִּי 'im-mî, כּוּלִּי kûl-lî. If without the tone, they have, like the rest, short vowels; but, if bearing the tone, either short vowels as קָלִי, הֶפְנִי, or long, as שָׁמָּה, הֶפְּמָה.

On the omission of the strengthening of a consonant at the end of a word, see § 20 l.

r 7. Syllables ending with *two* consonants occur only at the end of words, and have most naturally short vowels, וַיִּשָּׁב, קָטְלָהּ; but sometimes *Sere*, as גִּרְרָה, וַיִּבְרָה, or *Holem*, הוֹסִיף קִשְׁטָה. Cf., however, § 10 i. Usually the harshness of pronunciation is avoided by the use of a helping vowel (§ 28 e).

§ 27. *The Change of the Vowels, especially as regards Quantity.*

a The changes in sound through which the Hebrew language passed, before it assumed the form in which we know it from the Masoretic text of the O.T. (see § 2 k), have especially affected its vowel system. A precise knowledge of these vowel changes, which is indispensable for the understanding of most of the present forms of the language, is derived partly from the phenomena which the language itself presents in the laws of derivation and inflexion, partly from the comparison of the kindred dialects, principally the Arabic. By these two methods, we arrive at the following facts as regards Hebrew:

b 1. That in an open syllable the language has frequently retained only a half-vowel (*Šewâ mobile*), where there originally stood a full short vowel, e. g. עֲגָלָה (ground-form 'ăgālât) *a waggon*, צִדְקָה (ground-form šadāqāt) *righteousness*, קָטְלִי (Arab. qātālû), יִקְטְלִי (Arab. jūqattilû).

c 2. That vowels originally short have in the tone-syllable, as also in the open syllable preceding it, been generally changed into the corresponding tone-long vowels, *ă* into *ā*, *ĭ* into *ē*, *ũ* into *ō* (see § 9, a-e, k, r). If, however, the tone be shifted or weakened, these tone-long vowels mostly revert to their original shortness, or, occasionally, are still further shortened, or reduced to mere *Šewâ mobile*, or, finally, are entirely lost through a change in the division of syllables; e. g. מֶטֶר (Arab. mātār) *rain*, when in close dependence on a following genitive in the *construct state*, becomes מֵטֶר; עֶקֶב (Arab. 'ăqīb) *heel*, dual עֶקְבַּיִם, dual *construct* (with attenuation of the original *ă* of the first syllable to *ĭ*) עֶקְבַּי [on the *ṭ*, see § 20 k]; יִקְטֹל (Arab. yāqtūl), plur. יִקְטְלוּ (Arab. yāqtūlū). For instances of complete loss, as in בִּסְפִי, cf. § 93 m.

According to § 26, the following details of vowel-change must be observed :

1. The original, or a kindred short vowel reappears—

d

(a) When a closed syllable loses the tone (§ 26 o). Thus, יָד *hand*, but יְדִיהוָה *the hand of Yahwe*; בֶּן *son*, but בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ *the son of the king*; כָּל *the whole*, but כָּל־הָעָם *the whole of the people*; so also when a tone-bearing closed syllable loses the tone on taking a suffix, e.g. אֹיֵב *enemy*, but אֹיֵבְךָ *thy enemy*; finally, when the tone recedes, יָקָם, but יִקָּם (wayyāqōm); יָלַךְ, but יִלָּךְ.

(b) To the same category belong cases like סֵפֶר *book*, but סִפְרִי *my book*; קֹדֶשׁ *holiness*, but קִדְשִׁי *my holiness*. In spite of the helping vowel, סֵפֶר and קֹדֶשׁ are really closed syllables with a tone-long vowel; when the syllable loses the tone, the original *i* or *ō* (properly *ū*) reappears.

The same is true of syllables with a virtually sharpened final consonant: the lengthening of original *i* to *ē* and *ū* to *ō* takes place only in a tone-bearing syllable; in a toneless syllable the *i* or *ō* (or *ū*) remains, e.g. אִם *mother*, but אִמִּי *my mother*; חָק *law*, plur. חֻקִּים; but עֹז *strength*, עֲזִי (and עֻזִּי) *my strength*.

2. The lengthening of the short vowel to the corresponding long, *e* takes place—

(a) When a closed syllable becomes open by its final consonant being transferred to a suffix beginning with a vowel, or in general to the following syllable, e.g. קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּהּ *he has killed him*; מִסְכָּתִי primarily from מִסְכָּת. Similarly *ā* mostly becomes *ā* even before a suffix beginning with *šewā* mobile; e.g. קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּהּ from קָטַל, מִסְכָּתְךָ, מִסְכָּתְךָ.

(b) When a syllable has become open by complete loss of the *f* strengthening of its final consonant (a guttural or *Rêš*), e.g. בִּרְרַךְ for בִּרְרַךְ, see § 22 c. Cf. also § 20 n.

(c) When a weak consonant (א, ו, י) following the short vowel *g* quiesces in this vowel, according to § 23 a, c, d, § 24 f, e.g. מִצָּא for מִצָּא, where the א, losing its consonantal value, loses also the power of closing the syllable, and the open syllable requires a long vowel.

(d) Very frequently through the influence of the *pause*, i. e. the *h* principal tone in the last word of a sentence or clause (§ 29 k). Sometimes also through the influence of the article (§ 35 o).

3. When a word increases at the end and the tone is consequently *i* moved forward, or when, in the *construct state* (see § 89), or otherwise in close connexion with the following word, its tone is weakened, in such cases a full vowel (short or tone-long) may, by a change in the

division of syllables, be weakened to *Šewā mobile*, or even be entirely lost, so that its place is taken by the mere syllable-divider (*Šewā quiescens*). Examples of the first case are, שֵׁם *name*, pl. שִׁמוֹת, but שְׁמִי *my name*, שְׁמוֹתָם *their names*, דָּבָר *word*, constr. st. דְּבַר; צְדָקָה *righteousness*, constr. st. צְדָקָת; an example of the second case is, בְּרָכָה *blessing*, constr. st. בְּרַכְתָּ. Whether the vowel is retained or becomes *Šewā* (דָם, דָּמִי, but שֵׁם, שְׁמִי), and which of the two disappears in two consecutive syllables, depends upon the character of the form in question. In general the rule is that only those vowels which stand in an open syllable can become *Šewā*.

Thus the change into *Šewā* takes place in—

k (a) The *ā* and *ē* of the first syllable, especially in the inflexion of nouns, e. g. דָּבָר *word*, plur. דְּבָרִים; גָּדוֹל *great*, fem. גְּדוֹלָה; לֵבָב *heart*, לִבִּי *my heart*; but also in the verb, תָּשׁוּב *she will return*, plur. תִּשְׁוֹבָנָה, and so always, when the originally short vowel of the prefixes of the Imperfect comes to stand in an open syllable which is not pretonic. On the other hand, an *ā* lengthened from *ā* before the tone is retained in the *Perfect consecutive* of Qal even in the secondary tone, e. g. וְקָטַלְתָּ; cf. § 49 i.

l (b) The short, or merely tone-long, vowels *a*, *e*, *o* of the ultima, especially in verbal forms, e. g. קָטַל, fem. קָטַלָה *qāṭalā*; יָקַטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ; but note also יִלְקְטוּן, יִתְדַבְּקוּן, &c., according to § 47 m and o. The helping vowels are either entirely omitted, e. g. מֶלֶךְ *king* (ground-form *malk*), מִלְכִי *my king*; or, under the influence of a guttural, are weakened to *Ḥateph*, e. g. נָעַר *boy*, נֶעְרִי *his boy*. If the tone remains unmoved, the vowel also is retained, notwithstanding the lengthening of the word, e. g. יָקַטְלוּ *pausal-form* for יִקְטְלוּ.

m Where the tone moves forward two places, the former of the two vowels of a dissyllabic word may be shortened, and the second changed into *Šewā*. Cf. דָּבָר *word*; in the plur. דְּבָרִים; with heavy suffix דְּבָרֵיהֶם (cf. § 28 a) *their words*. On the attenuation of the *ā* to *i*, see further, s, t.

n Rem. 1. An *ō* arising from *aw* = *au*, or by an obscuring of *ā* (see § 9 b), sometimes becomes *ū*, when the tone is moved forward, e. g. נָקוּם, נִקְמוּתָם (see *Paradigm Perf. Niph.* of קִים); מְנוּסָה *flight*, fem. מְנוּסָה, with suffix, מְנוּסָי. The not uncommon use of *i* in a sharpened syllable, as בְּחִינִי Ez 20¹⁸ (for בְּחִינִי, cf. also the examples in § 9 o), is to be regarded as an orthographic licence, although sometimes in such cases *ū* may really have been intended by the *Kethibh*.

O Of the vowels of the *U*-class, *ū* and tone-long *ō* stand in a tone-bearing

closed final syllable, and *ō* in 'a toneless syllable, e.g. יָקִים *he will arise*, יָקִם jussive, *let him arise*, וַיָּקָם and *he arose*. The only instance of *ū* in an ultima which has lost the tone is וַיִּרָם Ex 16²⁰ (see § 67 n). Similarly, of vowels of the *I*-class, *ē*, *î*, and *ē* stand in a tone-bearing closed final syllable, and *ē* in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָקִים *he will raise*, יָקִם *let him raise*, וַיָּקָם and *he raised*. The only instance of *î* in an ultima which has lost the tone is וַיִּתְּרֵן Ju 9⁵³ (see § 67 p).

2. In the place of a *Pathah* we not infrequently find (according to § 9 f) *P* a *S^{eghōl}* (*ē*, *ē*) as a modification of *ā*:

(a) In a closed antepenultima, e.g. in the proper names אַבְרָהָם and אַבְרָם, where LXX 'Αβι- = 'אַבְ, which is certainly the better reading, cf. Ulmer, *Die semit. Eigennamen*, 1901, p. 12; or in a closed penultima, e.g. יָהוּדָה, but also יָדְכֶם *your hand*, for *yad^hkhēm*. In all these cases the character of the surrounding consonants (see § 6 q) has no doubt had an influence.

(b) Regularly before a guttural with *Qameṣ* or *Hateph Qameṣ*, *q* where the strengthening has been dropped, provided that a lengthening of the *Pathah* into *Qameṣ* be not necessary, e.g. אֶחָיו *his brothers*, for 'ahāw; כֶּחָשׁ *false*, for kahāš; פֶּחָה *governor*, constr. st. פֶּחָה; פֶּחָם *coal*; חַיִּי *the living* (with the article, הַ for הֶ); יָתְחָם Nu 23¹⁹, &c., and so always before הֶ and הֵ, as הַחֳדָשִׁים *the months*, see § 35 k. Before הֶ and הֵ *S^{eghōl}* generally stands only in the second syllable before the tone, e.g. הַהָרִים *the mountains*; הָעוֹן *the guilt*; immediately before the tone *Pathah* is lengthened into a (pretonic) *Qameṣ*, e.g. הָהָרִים, הָהָרִים; but cf. also הַפְּתָרִי Nu 8⁷. Before the weak consonants א and ר (cf. § 22 c, q), the lengthening of the *Pathah* into *Qameṣ* almost always takes place, e.g. הָאָב *the father*, pl. הָאָבוֹת; הָרֹאשׁ *the head*, pl. הָרֹאשִׁים. Exceptions, הָרָה *towards the mountain*, Gn 14¹⁰, in the tone-syllable, for hārā; יִבְרָכְיָהוּ (pr. name) for יִבְרָכְיָהוּ. On הֶ as a form of the interrogative הֶ (הֶ), see § 100 n; on מָה for מָה (מָה), § 37 e, f. Finally, אֶכְלֶךָ Ex 33³ also comes partly under this head, in consequence of the loss of the strengthening, for אֶכְלֶךָ, and יְחַזְקֶאל *Ezekiel* for יְחַזְקֶאל = יְחַזְקֶאל *God strengthens*.

(c) As a modification of the original *Pathah* in the first class of the segholate *r* forms (§ 93 g), when a helping vowel (§ 28 e) is inserted after the second consonant. Thus the ground-form *kalb* (*dog*), after receiving a helping *S^{eghōl}*, is modified into כֶּלֶב (also in modern Arabic pronounced kelb),¹ yarḥ (*month*), with a helping *Pathah*, יָרַח. The same phenomenon appears also in the formation of verbs, in cases like יָגֵל (jussive of the Hiph'il of גָּלָה), with a helping *S^{eghōl}*, for yagl.

3. The attenuation of *ā* to *î* is very common in a toneless closed syllable. *S*

(a) In a firmly closed syllable, מִדּוֹ *his measure*, for מִדּוֹ (in a sharpened syllable); יִלְרִתִּי *I have begotten thee*, from יִלְרִתִּי with the suffix תִּי; cf. Lv 11⁴⁴, Ez 38²³, and § 44 d. Especially is this the case in a large number of *segholates*

¹ So the LXX write Μελαχισεδέκ for מִלְכִּי־עֶדֶק.

from the ground-form *qatl*, when combined with singular suffixes, e.g. צִדְקִי *my righteousness*, for *ṣadqî*.

t (b) In a loosely-closed syllable, i.e. one followed by an aspirated *Begadkephath*, as דְּמַמְּכֶם *your blood*, for דְּמַמְּכֶם, and so commonly in the *st. constr. plur.* of segholates from the ground-form *qatl*, e.g. בְּגָדִי from בְּגָד (ground-form *bagd*) *a garment*. In most cases of this kind the attenuation is easily intelligible from the nature of the surrounding consonants. It is evident from a comparison of the dialects, that the attenuation was consistently carried out in a very large number of noun and verb-forms in Hebrew, as will be shown in the proper places.¹

u 4. *S'ghôl* arises, in addition to the cases mentioned in o and p, also from the weakening of *ā* of the final syllable in the isolated cases (הָ— for הָ—) in 1 S 28¹⁵ (? see § 48 d), ψ 20⁴ (?), Is 59⁵, Pr 24¹⁴ (see § 48 l); for examples of Locative forms in הָ— see § 90 i end.

v 5. Among the *Ḥaṭeph*-sounds — is shorter and lighter than —, and consequently the vowel group — is shorter than —; e.g. אֶדוֹם *Edom*, but אֶדְמוֹמִי (*Edomite*), shortened at the beginning because the tone is thrown forward; אֶמֶת (*mèth*) *truth*, אֶמְתּוֹ *his truth*; נֶעְלָם *hidden*, pl. נֶעְלָמִים *הַעֲבֵרְתִּי*; but also conversely נֶעְשָׂה *fem. נֶעְשִׂתָּה*, cf. § 63 f, 3.

w 6. To the chapter on vowel changes belongs lastly the *dissimilation* of vowels, i.e. the change of one vowel into another entirely heterogeneous, in order to prevent two similar, or closely related vowels, from following one another in the same word.² Hence לֹלֵא for *lû lô* (unless). Cf. also חִצּוֹן from חוּץ; עֵירֹם from עֵיר; נֶכֶח from נֶחָ; תִּכּוֹן from תִּכּוֹן; רֹאשׁ from רֹאשׁוֹן; most probably also יָלוֹד *offspring*, קַפּוֹר *porcupine*, for 'קפ', see § 68 c, note.— On the proper names יְהוּא and יִשׁוּעַ, which were formerly explained in the same way, see now Prätorius, *ZDMG.* 1905, p. 341 f.

§ 28. *The Rise of New Vowels and Syllables.*

a 1. According to § 26 m a half-syllable, i.e. a consonant with *Šewâ* mobile (always weakened from a short vowel), can only occur in close dependence on a full syllable. If another half-syllable with simple *Šewâ* follows, the first takes a full short vowel again.³ This vowel is almost always *Hireq*. In most cases it is probably an attenuation of an original *ā*, and never a mere helping vowel. In some instances analogy may have led to the choice of the *î*. Thus, according to § 102 d, the prefixes בְּ, פְּ, לְ before a consonant with *Šewâ* mobile become בֶּ, פֶּ, לֶ, e.g. בֶּפְרִי, פֶּפְרִי, לֶפְרִי; before י they are pointed as in בִּיהִירָה (from *bi-yêhûdā*, according to § 24 c); so too with *Wāw* copulative, e.g. בִּיהִירָה for 'יִ attenuated from 'י. The first half-

¹ Analogous to this attenuation of *ā* to *î* is the Lat. *tango, attingo; laxus, prolixus*; to the transition of *ā* to *ē* (see above, a), the Lat. *carpo, decerpo; spargo, conspergo*.

² Cf. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semit. Spr.*, p. xxix; A. Müller, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1892, p. 177 f., and Nestle, *ibid.*, p. 573 f.

³ Except י and, which generally becomes י before a simple *Šewâ*, cf. § 104 c.

syllable, after the restoration of the short vowel, sometimes combines with the second to form a firmly closed syllable, e. g. לָגַפַּל Nu 14³ for *linēphōl*, and so almost always in the infin. constr. after ל (§ 45 g); in isolated cases also with כ, as כְּנֹכַר Jer 17².

2. If a guttural with *Ḥateph* follows, the original *ā* of the prefixes *b* is retained before *Ḥateph Pathah*, but before *Ḥateph Seghol* or *Ḥateph Qames* it is modified to the short vowel contained in the *Ḥateph*. Thus arise the vowel groups $\frac{\text{אֶ}}$, $\frac{\text{אִ}}$, $\frac{\text{אֵ}}$, e. g. וְאֵנִי and *I*, בְּאֶשֶׁר as, לְעֹבֵד to *serve*, לְאֹכֵל to *eat*, לְחָלִי in *sickness*. On the Metheg with every such short vowel, see § 16 f, δ. Sometimes here also a fully closed syllable is formed. In such a case, the prefix takes the short vowel, which would have belonged to the suppressed *Ḥateph*, e. g. לְחָטַב for לְחָטַב; לְחָטַם for לְחָטַם (see § 67 ce); לְאָסַר but also לְאָסַר; and even וְעָצַר Jb 4², cf. Gn 32¹⁶. So always in the Infin. and Imperat. Qal of the verbs הָיָה to *be* and חָיָה to *live*, e. g. לְהָיִית׀ to *be*, וְהָיִי and *be ye*; even with מֵן, as מְהִיִּית׀, on which cf. § 102 b; but וְהָיָה and *be*, וְחָיָה and *live*, have *ē* instead of *ī* under the prefix. For the Metheg, cf. § 16 f, ε.

3. When a *Ḥateph* in the middle of a word, owing to flexional *c* changes, would stand before a vocal *Šewā*, it is changed into the short vowel, with which it is compounded. This applies especially to cases in which the *Ḥateph* stands under a guttural instead of quiescent *Šewā*, as an echo of the preceding short vowel, e. g. יַעֲמֹד he *will stand* (for יַעֲמֹד), but plur. יַעֲמֹדִי for *ya'amēdhû*, and נִהְפְּכוּ for *nehāphēkhû* (*they have turned themselves*), הִפְעִלְךָ *thy work*, cf. § 26 k. The syllables are to be divided *yā'ā-mēdhû*, and the second *ā* is to be regarded exactly as the helping *Pathah* in נָעַר, &c.¹

4. At the end of words, syllables occur which close with two con- *d* sonants (§ 10 i, § 26 r), but only when the latter of the two is an emphatic consonant (ט, ק) or a tenuis (viz. ב, ד, ג, ת²), e. g. יָשָׁט let *him turn aside*, וַיִּשְׁק and *he caused to drink*, אָמַרְתָּ thou (fem.) *hast said*, וַיִּבֶה and *he wept*, וַיִּרֶד and *let him have dominion*, וַיִּשָּׁב and *he took captive*.

This harsh ending is elsewhere avoided by the Masora,³ which *e* inserts between the two final consonants a helping vowel, usually

¹ In Ju 16¹³ read תִּאֲרָנִי not (with Opatius, Hahn and others) תִּאֲרָנִי.

² With a final ה, the only example is תּוֹסֵף Pr 30⁶, where several MSS. and printed editions incorrectly have ה without Dageš. Instead of this masoretic caprice we should no doubt read תּוֹסֵף.

³ An analogy to this practice of the Masora is found among the modern Beduin, who pronounce such a helping vowel before *h, h, ḡ, ḡ*; cf. Spitta, *Gramm. des arab. Vulgärdialektes von Aegypten*, Lpz. 1880, § 43 d.

Šeḡhōl, but with medial or final gutturals a *Pathah*,¹ and after *ḥ* a *Hireq*, e. g. וַיִּגְלוּ and he revealed, for wayyigl; יָרַב let it multiply, for yirb; קִדְּשׁ holiness, ground-form qudš; נָחַל brook, ground-form nahl; שָׁלַחְתָּ² for שָׁלַחְתָּ thou hast sent; בַּיִת house, ground-form bayt. These helping vowels are, however, to be regarded as exactly like *furtive Pathah* (§ 22 f, g); they do not alter the monosyllabic character of the forms, and they disappear before formative suffixes, e. g. קִדְּשִׁי my holiness, בַּיְתָה home-ward.

f 5. On the rise of a full vowel in place of a simple *Šewa*, under the influence of the pause, see § 29 m; on initial א for אָ, see § 23 h.

§ 29. The Tone, its Changes and the Pause.

- a 1. The principal tone rests, according to the Masoretic accentuation (cf. § 15 c), as a rule on the final syllable, e. g. קָטַל, דָּבָר, דְּבָרוֹ, דְּבָרִים, קָטַלְתָּם, קָטַלְוּ, קָרְדִּין—in the last five examples on the formative additions to the stem. Less frequently it rests on the penultima, as in לַיְלָה night, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְוּ, קָטַלְתָּ; but a closed penultima can only have the tone if the ultima is open (e. g. קָטַלְתָּ, לִבְנָה, קָמְנָה), whilst a closed ultima can as a rule only be without the tone if the penultima is open, e. g. וַיָּקָם, וַיָּקָם; see also below, e.
- b A kind of counter-tone or secondary stress, as opposed to the principal tone, is marked by *Metheg* (§ 16 c). Words which are closely united by *Maqqeph* with the following word (§ 16 a) can at the most have only a secondary tone.
- c 2. The original tone of a word, however, frequently shifts its place in consequence either of changes in the word itself, or of its close connexion with other words. If the word is increased at the end, the tone is moved forward (*descendit*) one or two places according to the length of the addition, e. g. דָּבָר word, plur. דְּבָרִים; דְּבָרֶיךָ your words; קֹדֶשׁ holy thing, plur. קֹדֶשִׁים; קָטַלְתָּ with suffix קָטַלְתָּהּ, with *Wāw consecutive* וְקָטַלְתָּ. On the consequent vowel-changes, see § 27 d, i-m.
- d 3. On the other hand, the original tone is shifted from the ultima to the penultima (*ascendit*):

¹ On the apparent exceptions וַיִּשָּׂא, &c., cf. § 22 e; other instances in which א has entirely lost its consonantal value, and is only retained orthographically, are חַטָּא sin, נָי valley (also נַי), וַיִּשָּׂא vanity (Jb 15³¹ קִישִׁיב וַיִּשָּׂא).

² In this form (§ 65 g) the *Dageš lene* remains in the final *Tāw*, although a vowel precedes, in order to point out that the helping *Pathah* is not to be regarded as a really full vowel, but merely as an orthographic indication of a very slight sound, to ensure the correct pronunciation. An analogous case is יִהְיֶה *yihād* from יָהָה (§ 75 r).

(a) In many forms of the Imperfect, under the influence of a prefixed *Wāw consecutive* (וַיִּ see § 49 c-e), e.g. וַיֹּאמֶר *he will say*, וַיֵּאמֶר *and he said*; וַיֵּלֶךְ *he will go*, וַיֵּלֶךְ *and he went*. Cf. also § 51 n on the impf. Niph'al, and § 65 g, end, on the impf. Pi'el; on these forms in Pause, when the ו consec. does not take effect, see below, p.

(b) For rhythmical reasons (as often in other languages), when *e* a monosyllable, or a word with the tone on the first syllable, follows a word with the tone on the ultima, in order to avoid the concurrence of two tone-syllables.¹ This rhythmical retraction of the tone, however (נָסוּן אַחֲרֵי receding, as it is called by the Jewish grammarians), is only admissible according to *a*, above, provided that the penultima, which now receives the tone, is an open syllable (with a long vowel; but see *g*), whilst the ultima, which loses the tone, must be either an open syllable with a long vowel, e.g. קָרָא לִיָּהּ Gn 1⁵, 4¹⁷, 27²⁵, Ex 16²⁹, ψ 5¹¹, 104¹⁴, Dn 11¹³, or a closed syllable with a short vowel, e.g. תָּאֲבֹל לָהֶם Gn 3¹⁹, Jb 3³, 22²⁸.² The grave suffixes -בָּם, -בֹּן, -הֶם, -וֹן are exceptions, as they never lose the tone. Moreover a fair number of instances occur in which the above conditions are fulfilled, but the tone is not retracted, e.g. esp. with הִיָּה, and before א; cf. Qimḥi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenberg (Lyck, 1862), p. 4^b, line 13 ff.

Although *Sere* can remain in a closed ultima which has lost the tone, it *f* is perhaps not to be regarded in this case (see § 8 b) as a long vowel. At any rate it then always has, in correct editions, a retarding *Metheg*, no doubt in order to prevent its being pronounced as *Sēghōl*, e.g. לְבַעֲרָה קָן Nu 24²²; cf. Nu 17²³, Ju 20², Is 66³, Jer 23²⁹, Ez 22²⁵, ψ 37⁷, and even with a following *furtive Pathah* Pr 1¹⁹, 11²⁶, &c., although there is no question here of two successive tone-syllables. In other cases the shortening into *Sēghōl* does take place, e.g. הוֹלֵם פָּעַם *who smiteth the anvil*, Is 41⁷, for הוֹלֵם פָּעַם; מָאֵת שְׁמֹר 1 K 16²⁴.—The retraction of the tone even occurs when a half-syllable with a *Šewâ* mobile precedes the original tone-syllable, e.g. וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ Gn 19⁵, and frequently; יוֹדְרִי בּוֹר ψ 28¹; טָמְנוּ לִי

¹ Even Hebrew *prose* proceeds, according to the accentuation, in a kind of iambic rhythm. That this was intended by the marking of the tone, can be seen from the use of *Metheg*.—Jos. Wijnkoop in *Darke hannesigah sive leges de accentus Hebraicae linguae ascensione*, Ludg. Bat. 1881, endeavours to explain, on euphonic and syntactical grounds, the numerous cases in which the usual retraction of the tone does not occur, e.g. וְבוֹרָא הָשֶׁה Is 45⁷, where the object probably is to avoid a kind of hiatus; but cf. also Am 4¹³. Prätorius, *Ueber den rückweich. Accent im Hebr.*, Halle, 1897, has fully discussed the *nasog 'aḥor*.

² The reading עָרִיִּים (so even Opatius and Hahn) Ez 16⁷ for עָרִיִּים is rightly described by Baer as 'error turpis'.—That an unchangeable vowel in a closed final syllable cannot lose the tone is shown by Prätorius from the duplication of the accent (see above, § 22 f).

ψ 31⁵; מְטַעֲנִי חֶרֶב; Is 14¹⁹; as also when the tone-syllable of the second word is preceded by a half-syllable, e.g. עֲשֵׂה פָרִי Gn 1¹¹ (on the *Dag. f.*, cf. § 20 f); לָחֵת לֶךְ Gn 15⁷ (cf. § 20 c).

g According to the above, it must be regarded as anomalous when the Masora throws back the tone of a closed ultima upon a *virtually* sharpened syllable with a short vowel, e.g. אָחֵר בֵּן 1 S 10⁵, § 101 a; בּוֹ וְכָהֵן Jb 8¹⁸, cf. Lv 5²²; לִצְחָק Gn 39^{14,17}, cf. Ho 9²; whereas it elsewhere allows a closed penultima to bear the tone only when the ultima is open. Still more anomalous is the placing of the tone on a *really* sharpened syllable, when the ultima is closed, as in הִקָּם עַל 2 S 23¹; נָכַר שׁוֹעַ Jb 34¹⁹; cf. also יָקָם מֶלֶךְ Gn 4²⁴, with Metheg of the secondary tone. We should read either הִקָּם, or, with Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 167, Ginsb., Kittel, after Bomb., הִקָּם. Other abnormal forms are וַיִּהְיוּ שָׁם Ex 4⁴ (for similar instances see § 15 c, end) and וַיְהִי שָׁם Dt 10⁵.

h (c) In *pause*, see i-v.

The meeting of two tone-syllables (see e, f) is avoided also by connecting the words with Maqqeph, in which case the first word entirely loses the tone, e.g. וַיִּכְתֹּב שָׁם and he wrote there, Jos 8³².

i 4. Very important changes of the tone and of the vowels are effected by the *pause*. By this term is meant the strong stress laid on the tone-syllable in the last word of a sentence (verse) or clause. It is marked by a great *distinctive accent*, *Sillûq*, *'Athnâh*, and in the accentuation of the books תַּא"ם, 'Ôlè w^eyôrêd (§ 15 h). Apart from these principal pauses (*the great pause*), there are often pausal changes (*the lesser pause*) with the lesser distinctives, especially *S^egolta*, *Zaqeph qaton*, *R^ebhî^a*, and even with *Pašta*, *Tiphha*, *Gereš*, and (Pr 30⁴) *Pazer*.¹ The changes are as follows:

k (a) When the tone-syllable naturally has a short vowel, it as a rule becomes tone-long in *pause*, e.g. קָטַל, קָטַל; מָיִם, מָיִם; קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ. An *ä* which has been modified to *S^eghôl* usually becomes *ā* in *pause*, e.g. קָשָׁר (ground-form *qašr*) in *pause* קָשָׁר 2 K 11¹⁴; אָרָץ אָרָץ Jer 22²⁹;

¹ In most cases, probably on account of a following guttural or (at the end of a sentence) ו (cf. e.g. Ex 21³¹, Jer 3⁹ [but Ginsb. וַתַּחֲנֶן], Ru 4⁴, Ec 11⁶ [but Ginsb. וַיִּכְשַׁר]; before י Jer 17¹¹) [see also § 29 w]. וַיִּשְׁפֹּט אֶת־ 1 S 7¹⁷, וַאֲרָץ Is 65¹⁷, Pr 25³, where *ā* has *munah*, are very irregular, but the lengthening here is probably only to avoid the cacophony *šāphāt 'et*. In the same way הִצְעֵלָה Ez 17¹⁵ (with *Mahpakh* before ה) and וַיִּקְרָם Ez 37⁸ (with *Darga* before ו) are to be explained. The four instances of אָנִי for אֲנִי apparently require a different explanation; see § 32 c.—The theory of Olshausen and others that the phenomena of the *pause* are due *entirely* to liturgical considerations, i. e. that it is 'a convenient way of developing the musical value of the final accents by means of fuller forms' in liturgical reading (Sievers, *Met. Studien*, i. 236, also explains pausal forms like קָטַלְתָּ, וַיִּקְטְלוּ, as 'late formations of the grammarians'), is contradicted by the fact that similar phenomena are still to be observed in modern vulgar Arabic, where they can only be attributed to rhythmical reasons of a general character.

also in 2 K 4³¹ read קָשֶׁב with ed. Mant., &c. (Baer קָשֶׁב!).—דָּבָר becomes in *pause* דְּבָר.

Sometimes, however, the distinct and sharper *ā* is intentionally retained *l* in *pause*, especially if the following consonant is strengthened, e.g. יִבְרָהוּ Jb 4²⁰, or ought to be strengthened, e.g. בָּבֶת 2 S 12³, בֶּן Is 8¹, &c.; but also in other cases as זִקְנָתִי Gn 27², because from זָקֵן, cf. below, *q*; אָר Gn 49²⁷; וְהָקֵן שָׁנֹו; 2 Ch 29¹⁹ (so Baer, but Ginsb. 'הִקֵּךְ, ed. Mant. 'הִקֵּךְ); and regularly in the numeral אַרְבַּע *four*, Lv 11²⁰, &c. In the accentuation of the three poetical books (§ 15 *d*) the use of *Pathah* with '*Athnah* is due to the inferior pausal force of '*Athnah*, especially after 'Ôlè *weyôred* (§ 15 *o*); cf. ψ 100⁸, Pr 3c⁹, and Qimhi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenberg, p. 5^b, line 4 from below. Compare the list of instances of pausal *ā* and *ê* in the appendices to Baer's editions.

(b) When a full vowel in a tone-bearing final syllable has lost the *m* tone before an affirmative, and has become *vocal Šewā*, it is restored in *pause* as tone-vowel, and, if short, is lengthened, e.g. קָטַל, *fem.* קָטְלָה (*qāt'elā*), in *pause* קָטַלָּה; שָׁמַעוּ (*šim'ū*), in *pause* שָׁמַעֻו (from sing. שָׁמַע); מָלָאָה, מְלָאָה; יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ (sing. יִקְטַל). The fuller endings of the Imperfect וִי and וְ— (§ 47 *m* and *o*) alone retain the tone even when the original vowel is restored. In segholate forms, like לָחִי, לָחִי (ground-form *lahy*, *pary*), the original *ā* returns, though under the form of a tone-bearing *Seghōl*, thus לָחִי, לָחִי; original *ī* becomes *ē*, e.g. חָצִי, in *pause* חָצִי; original *ō* (*ū*) becomes *ō*, חָלִי (ground-form *huly*), in *pause* חָלִי (§ 93 *x*, *y*, *z*).

On the analogy of such forms as לָחִי, &c., the shortened Imperfects *n* יְהִי and יְחִי become in *pause* יְהִי, יְחִי, because in the full forms יְהִי *he will be*, and יְחִי *he will live*, the *ī* is attenuated from an original *ā*. Similarly שָׁכַם *shoulder*, in *pause* שָׁכַם (ground-form *šakhm*), and the pron. אֲנִי *I*, in *pause* אֲנִי; cf. also the restoration of the original *ā* as *ê* before the suffix תְּ— *thy*, *thee*, e.g. דְּבָרְךָ *thy word*, in *pause* דְּבָרְךָ; יִשְׁמְרְךָ *he guards thee*, in *pause* יִשְׁמְרְךָ; but after the prepositions בְּ, לְ, אֶת (אֶת) the suffix תְּ— in *pause* becomes תְּ—, e.g. בְּךָ, לְךָ, אֶתְךָ.

(c) This tendency to draw back the tone in *pause* to the *penultima* *o* appears also in such cases as אֲנִי *I*, in *pause* אֲנִי; אַתָּה *thou*, in *pause* אַתָּה (but in the three poetically accented books also אַתָּה, since in those books '*Athnah*, especially after 'Ôlè *weyôred*, has only the force of a *Zaqeph*; hence also יִפְלְאוּ Pr 24⁴ instead of יִפְלְאוּ²; עַתָּה *now*, עַתָּה; and in other sporadic instances, like פָּלוּ ψ 37²⁰ for פָּלוּ; but in 1 S 12²⁵

¹ Such a pausal syllable is sometimes further emphasized by strengthening the following consonant, see § 20 *i*.

² יִפְלְאוּ ψ 45⁶, cf. also יִפְלְמוּ ψ 40¹⁶, is to be explained in the same way, but not יִפְלְמוּ Zc 2¹¹, where, on the analogy of הִשְׁמִירִי Je 9³, we should expect הִפְלְמִי.

תָּפַפִּי with Baer and Ginsb., is to be preferred to the reading of ed. Mant., &c.

p (d) Conversely all forms of imperfects consecutive, whose final syllable, when not in *pause*, loses the tone and is pronounced with a short vowel, take, when in *pause*, the tone on the ultima with a tone-long vowel, e. g. וַיָּמָת and he died, in *pause* וַיָּמָת.

q Of other effects of the *pause* we have still to mention, (1) the transition of an *e* (lengthened from *i*) to the more distinct *ā* (see above, l), e. g. הָיוּ for הָיוּ Is 18⁵ (cf. § 67 *v*; § 72 *ad*); קָמַל Is 33⁹; אָצַל I Ch 8³⁸ (beside אָצַל [see *v*. 37. Cf. טָבַאֵל Is 7⁶ טָבַאֵל Ezr 4⁷]; שָׁשֶׁר Jer 22¹⁴; סָפָר Ob 20; וַיִּנָּשׁ Ex 31¹⁷; וַיֵּאָנֶשׁ 2 S 12¹⁵ (below, § 51 *m*)—S. R. D.]—הָפַר Gn 17¹⁴; הָפָצַר I S 15²³; הָשִׁיב ψ 40¹⁸; הָרַחַק Jb 13²¹, mostly before liquids or sibilants (but also הָשִׁיב Is 42²², and without the *pause* הָרַד La 3⁴⁸). So also הָלַךְ (shortened from הָלַךְ) becomes in *pause* הָלַךְ; cf. וַיֵּלֶךְ La 3²; הָלַךְ for הָלַךְ Ju 19²⁰. On *S^eghôl* in *pause* instead of *Sere*, cf. § 52 *n*, 60 *d*, and especially § 75 *n*, on וָחִיָּה Pr 4⁴ and 7².

r (2) The transition from *ā* to *e* in the ultima; so always in the formula וְעַד לְעוֹלָם וָעַד (for עַד) for ever and ever.

s (3) The *pausal Qames* (according to § 54 *k*, lengthened from original *ā*) in *Hithpa'el* (but not in *Pi'el*) for *Sere*, e. g. יִתְהַלֵּךְ Jb 18⁸ for יִתְהַלֵּךְ. But *pausal* forms like שָׁבַט, שָׁתַר (in the *absol. st.* שָׁבַט, שָׁתַר) go back to a secondary form of the *abs. st.* שָׁבַט, שָׁתַר.

t (4) The restoration of a final *Yodh* which has been dropped from the stem, together with the preceding vowel, e. g. אָתָיו Is 21¹², for בָּעָיו, the latter also without the *pause* Is 56^{9,12}; cf. Jb 12⁶, and the same occurrence even in the word before the *pause* Dt 32³⁷, Is 21¹².

u (5) The transition from *o* or *ō* to *ā* in *pause*: as שָׁאֵלָה Is 7¹¹, if it be a locative of שָׁאֵל, and not rather *imperat.* Qal of שָׁאֵל; שָׁבַלְתִּי Gn 43¹⁴ for שָׁבַלְתִּי; עָו Gn 49³; יִטְרָךְ Gn 49²⁷; perhaps also שָׁרָךְ I K 22³⁴, Is 59¹⁷, and מִשְׁקָלָת Is 28¹⁷, cf. 2 K 21¹³. On the other hand the regular *pausal* form יִחַפֵּן (ordinary imperfect יִחַפֵּן) corresponds to a perfect חָפִּין (see § 47 *h*).

v (6) When a *Pathah* both precedes and follows a virtually strengthened guttural, the second becomes *ā* in *pause*, and the first *S^eghôl*, according to § 22 *c* and § 27 *g*, e. g. אָחִי my brothers, in *pause* אָחִי. Similarly in cases where an original *Pathah* after a guttural has been attenuated to *i* out of *pause*, and then lengthened to *e* with the tone (cf. § 54 *k*), e. g. יִתְנַחֵם, but in *pause* יִתְנַחֵם Dt 32³⁶; cf. Nu 8⁷, 23¹⁹, Ez 5¹³, ψ 135¹⁴.—On *pausal Sere*, for *S^eghôl*, in *infinit.*, *imperat.*, and *imperf.* of verbs לָהֹךְ, see § 75 *hh*.

w [Other instances of the full vowel in lesser *pause*, where the voice would naturally rest on the word, are Gn 15¹⁴ יַעֲבֹדוּ, Is 8¹⁵, 40²⁴, Ho 4¹², 8⁷, Dn 9¹⁵, and very often in such cases.]

SECOND PART

ETYMOLOGY, OR THE PARTS OF SPEECH

§ 30. Stems and Roots¹: Biliteral, Triliteral, and Quadriliteral.

1. Stems in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic languages, have this peculiarity, that by far the majority of them consist of three consonants. On these the meaning essentially depends, while the various modifications of the idea are expressed rather by changes in the vowels, e. g. עֵמֶק (עִמְקָא or עֵמְקָא; the 3rd pers. sing. perf. does not occur) *it was deep*, עֵמֶק *deep*, עֵמְקָא *depth*, עֵמֶק, *a valley, plain*. Such a stem may be either a verb or a noun, and the language commonly exhibits both together, e. g. זָרַע *he has sown*, זֶרַע *seed*; חָכַם *he was wise*, חָכָם *a wise man*. For practical purposes, however, it has long been the custom to regard as the stem the 3rd pers. sing. Perf. Qal (see § 43), since it is one of the simplest forms of the verb, without any formative additions. Not only are the other forms of the verb referred to this stem, but also the noun-forms, and the large number of particles derived from nouns; e. g. קָדַשׁ *he was holy*, קִדְּשׁ *holiness*, קֹדֶשׁ *holy*.

Sometimes the language, as we have it, exhibits only the verbal *b* stem without any corresponding noun-form, e. g. סָקַל *to stone*, נָהַק *to bray*; and on the other hand, the noun sometimes exists without the corresponding verb, e. g. אֶבֶן *stone*, נֶגֶב *south*. Since, however, the nominal or verbal stems, which are not now found in Hebrew, generally occur in one or more of the other Semitic dialects, it may be assumed, as a rule, that Hebrew, when a living language, also possessed them. Thus, in Arabic, the verbal stem 'abīnā (*to become compact, hard*) corresponds to אָבַן, and the Aramaic verb *nēgab* (*to be dry*) to נָגַב.

Rem. 1. The Jewish grammarians call the stem (i. e. the 3rd pers. sing. Perf. Qal) שִׁרָשׁ root. Hence it became customary among Christian grammarians to call the stem *radix*, and its three consonants *litterae radicales*, in contradistinction to the *litterae serviles* or *formative letters*. On the correct use of the term *root*, see *g*.

¹ On the questions discussed here compare the bibliography at the head of § 79.

d 2. Others regard the three stem-consonants as a *root*, in the sense that, considered as *vowelless* and unpronounceable, it represents the common foundation of the verbal and nominal stems developed from it, just as in the vegetable world, from which the figure is borrowed, stems grow from the hidden root, e. g.

Root : מלך, the indeterminate idea of *ruling*.

Verb-stem, מלך he has reigned.

Noun-stem, מלך king.

For the historical investigation of the language, however, this hypothesis of unpronounceable roots, with indeterminate meaning, is fruitless. Moreover, the term *root*, as it is generally understood by philologists, cannot be applied to the Semitic triliteral stem (see *f*).¹

e 3. The 3rd sing. Perf. Qal, which, according to the above, is usually regarded, both lexicographically and grammatically, as the ground-form, is generally in Hebrew a dissyllable, e. g. קטל. The monosyllabic forms have only arisen by contraction (according to the traditional explanation) from stems which had a weak letter (ו or י) for their middle consonant, e. g. קם from *qāwām*; or from stems whose second and third consonants are identical, e. g. צר and צרר (but see below, §§ 67, 72). The dissyllabic forms have themselves no doubt arisen, through a loss of the final vowel, from trisyllables, e. g. קטל from *qātālā*, as it is in literary Arabic.

f 2. The law of the triliteral stem is so strictly observed in the formation of verbs and nouns in Hebrew (and in the Semitic languages generally), that the language has sometimes adopted artificial methods to preserve at least an appearance of triliteralism in monosyllabic stems, e. g. שָׁבַת for the inf. constr. of verbs שׁוּב; cf. § 69 *b*. Conversely such nouns, as אב father, אם mother, אח brother, which were formerly all regarded as original monosyllabic forms (*nomina primitiva*), may, in some cases at least, have arisen from mutilation of a triliteral stem.

g On the other hand, a large number of triliteral stems really point to a biliteral base, which may be properly called a *root* (*radix primaria, bilitteralis*), since it forms the starting-point for several triliteral modifications of the same fundamental idea. Though in themselves unpronounceable, these roots are usually pronounced with *ā* between the two consonants, and are represented in writing by the sign √, e. g. √כר as the root of כָּרַח, כָּרַה, כֹּר, אָכַר. The reduction of a stem to the underlying root may generally be accomplished with certainty when the stem exhibits one weak consonant with two strong ones, or when the second and third consonants are identical. Thus e. g. the stems דָּכַח, דָּכַה, דָּכָא, דָּוַח, דָּכַח may all be traced to the idea of *striking, breaking*, and the root common to them all is evidently the two strong consonants דך (*dakh*). Very frequently, however, the development of the root into a stem is effected by the addition of

¹ Cf. Philippi, 'Der Grundstamm des starken Verbums,' in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, Leipz. 1875, pp. 69-106.

a strong consonant, especially, it seems, a sibilant, liquid or guttural.¹ Finally, further modifications of the same root are produced when either a consonant of the root, or the letter which has been added, changes by phonetic laws into a kindred letter (see the examples below). Usually such a change of sound is accompanied by a modification of meaning.

Examples: from the root קץ (no doubt onomatopoeitic, i.e. imitating the *h* sound), which represents the fundamental idea of *carving off, cutting in pieces*, are derived directly: קצה and קצץ to *cut, to cut off*; the latter also metaph. to *decide, to judge* (whence קָצִין, Arab. qāḏī, a judge); also קָצַב to *cut off, to shear, to tear, to break, קָצַע to cut into, קָצַר to cut off, to reap*. With a dental instead of the sibilant, קט, קד, whence קָטַב to *cut in pieces, to destroy, קָטַל to cut down, to kill, קָטַף to tear off, to pluck off*. With the initial letter softened, the root becomes כס, whence כָּסַח to *cut off*, and כָּסַם to *shave*; cf. also נכס Syr. to *slay (sacrifice), to kill*. With the greatest softening נז and גז, נָזַז to *cut off, to shear*; גָּזַה to *hew stone*; נָזַם, נָזַע, נָזַל, נָזַר to *cut off, to tear off, eat up*; similarly נָזַר to *cut into, נָזַדע to cut off*; cf. also נָזַה, נָזַף, נָזַר. Allied to this root also is the series of stems which instead of a palatal begin with a guttural (ח), e.g. חָרַד to *split, cut*; cf. also חרל, חרק, חרר, חרש, and further חוס, חוש, חוץ, חזה, חזו, חטב, חטט, חטף, חסל, חסם, חסף, חשב, חצב, חציץ, חצר in the Lexicon.

The root **הם** expresses the sound of *humming*, which is made with the mouth closed (**מִוּוּ**); hence **הָמָה**, **הוּם**, **הָמָה**, **נָהָם** (**נָאָם**), Arab. *hámhama*, to buzz, to hum, to snarl, &c.

As developments from the root רע cf. the stems רעד, רעל, רעם, רעע, רעץ, רעץ. Not less numerous are the developments of the root בר (פר) and many others.²

Closer investigation of the subject suggests the following observations:

(a) These roots are mere *abstractions* from stems in actual use, and are themselves not used. They represent rather the hidden germs (*semina*) of the stems which appear in the language. Yet these stems are sometimes so short as to consist simply of the elements of the root itself, e.g. DN *to be finished*, LP *light*. The ascertaining of the root and its meaning, although in many ways very difficult and hazardous, is of great lexicographical importance. It is a wholly different and much contested question whether there ever was a period in the development of the Semitic languages when purely *biliteral* roots, either isolated and invariable or combined with inflexions, served for the communication of thought. In such a case it would have to be admitted, that the language at first expressed extremely few elementary ideas, which were only gradually extended by additions to denote more delicate shades of meaning. At all events this process of transformation would belong to a period of the language which is entirely outside our range. At the most only the gradual multiplication of *stems* by means of phonetic change (see below) can be historically proved.

(b) Many of these monosyllabic words are clearly imitations of sounds, and *k*

¹ That all trilateral stems are derived from bilaterals (as König, *Lehrg.* ii. 1, 370; M. Lambert in *Studies in honour of A. Kohut*, Berl. 1897, p. 354 ff.) cannot be definitely proved.

² Cf. the interesting examination of the Semitic roots QR, KR, XR, by P. Haupt in the *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, xxiii (1907), p. 241 ff.

to be *hot*. Cf. Aram. עָרַל to roll, expanded from עָל (conjugation Pa'el, corresponding to the Hebrew Pi'el). In Latin there is a similar expansion of *fid*, *scid*, *tud*, *jug* into *findo*, *scindo*, *tundo*, *jungo*. At the end of words the commonest expansion is by means of ל and ן, e.g. גִּרְוֹן axe, בִּרְמֶל garden-land (from בָּרֶם, גִּבְעֵל corolla (גִּבְעֵי cup); cf. § 85, xi.

Rem. on (b). Forms such as צַפְרָדַע frog, תְּבַצְלֵת meadow-saffron, צִלְמוֹת shadow *r* of death,¹ were long regarded as compounds, though the explanation of them all was uncertain. Many words of this class, which earlier scholars attempted to explain from Hebrew sources, have since proved to be *loan-words* (§ 1 i), and consequently need no longer be taken into account.

4. A special class of formations, distinct from the fully developed stems of three or four consonants, are (a) the *Interjections* (§ 105), which, as being direct imitations of natural sounds, are independent of the ordinary formative laws; (b) the *Pronouns*. Whether these are to be regarded as the mutilated remains of early developed stems, or as relics of a period of language when the formation of stems followed different laws, must remain undecided. At all events, the many peculiarities of their formation² require special treatment (§ 32 ff.). On the other hand, most of the particles (adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions) seem to have arisen in Hebrew from fully developed stems, although in many instances, in consequence of extreme shortening, the underlying stem is no longer recognizable (see § 99 ff.).

§ 31. Grammatical Structure.

P. Dörwald, 'Die Formenbildungsgesetze des Hebr.' (*Hilfsbuch für Lehrer des Hebr.*), Berlin, 1897, is recommended for occasional reference.

1. The formation of the parts of speech from the stems (derivation), *a* and their inflexion, are effected in two ways: (a) internally by changes in the stem itself, particularly in its vowels: (b) externally by the addition of formative syllables before or after it. The expression of grammatical relations (e.g. the comparative degree and some case-relations in Hebrew) periphrastically by means of separate words belongs, not to etymology, but to syntax.

The external method (b) of formation, by affixing formative syllables, *b* which occurs e.g. in Egyptian, appears on the whole to be the more ancient. Yet other families of language, and particularly the Semitic, at a very early period had recourse also to the internal method, and during their youthful vigour widely developed their power of forming derivatives. But the continuous decay of this power in the later periods of language made syntactical circumlocution more and more necessary. The same process may be seen also e.g. in Greek (including modern Greek), and in Latin with its Romance offshoots.

¹ So expressly Nöldeke in ZAW. 1897, p. 183 ff.; but most probably it is to be read צִלְמוֹת darkness from the stem צָלַם [Arab. *zalima*, to be dark].

² Cf. Hupfeld, 'System der semitischen Demonstrativbildung,' in the Ztschr. f. d. Kunde des Morgenl., vol. ii. pp. 124 ff., 427 ff.

c 2. Both methods of formation exist together in Hebrew. The internal mode of formation by means of vowel changes is tolerably extensive (קָטַל, קָטַל, קָטַל; קָטַל, קָטַל, &c.). This is accompanied in numerous cases by external formation also (הִתְקַטַּל, הִתְקַטַּל, &c.), and even these formative additions again are subject to internal change, e.g. הִתְקַטַּל, הִתְקַטַּל. The addition of formative syllables occurs, as in almost all languages, chiefly in the formation of the persons of the verb, where the meaning of the affixed syllables is for the most part still perfectly clear (see §§ 44, 47). It is also employed to distinguish gender and number in the verb and noun. Of case-endings, on the contrary, only scanty traces remain in Hebrew (see § 90).

CHAPTER I

THE PRONOUN

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 98 ff.; *Grundriss*, i. 296 ff. L. Reinisch, 'Das persönl. Fürwort u. die Verbalflexion in den chamito-semit. Sprachen' (*Wiener Akad. der Wiss.*, 1909).

§ 32. *The Personal Pronoun. The Separate Pronoun.*

1. The personal pronoun (as well as the pronoun generally) belongs *a* to the oldest and simplest elements of the language (§ 30 s). It must be discussed *before* the verb, since it plays an important part in verbal inflexion (§§ 44, 47).

2. The independent principal forms of the personal pronoun serve *b* (like the Gk. *ἐγώ*, *σύ*, Lat. *ego*, *tu*, and their plurals) almost exclusively to emphasize the nominative-subject (see, however, § 135 *d*). They are as follows:

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1. <i>Com.</i> אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי; } <i>I.</i> אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי }	1. <i>Com.</i> אֲנֵחֵנוּ, in pause אֲנֵחֵנוּ } <i>we.</i> (נִחֵנוּ, in pause נִחֵנוּ), (אֵנוּ) }
2. { <i>m.</i> אַתָּה (אַתָּה), in pause אַתָּה or אַתָּה <i>f.</i> אַתָּה (אַתָּה properly אַתָּה), } <i>thou.</i> in pause אַתָּה }	2. { <i>m.</i> אַתָּם <i>f.</i> אַתָּנָה (אַתָּנָה); אַתָּן (אַתָּן) } <i>ye.</i>
3. { <i>m.</i> הוּא <i>he</i> (<i>it</i>). <i>f.</i> הִיא <i>she</i> (<i>it</i>). }	3. { <i>m.</i> הֵם ("הֵם"), הֵמָּה <i>f.</i> הֵנָּה after prefixes הֵן, הֵן } <i>they.</i>

The forms enclosed in parentheses are the less common. A table of these pronouns with their shortened forms (*pronominal suffixes*) is given in Paradigm A at the end of this Grammar.

REMARKS.

I. *First Person.*

1. The form אֲנִי is less frequent than אֲנִי.¹ The former occurs in C

¹ On the prevalence of אֲנִי in the earlier Books compare the statistics collected by Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 251 ff., partly contested by Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, 1882, vol. xi. p. 222 ff. (but cf. his *Introduction*, ed. 6, p. 135, line 1 f.), but thoroughly established by König in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1893, pp. 464 ff. and 478, and in his *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 168, &c. In some of the latest books אֲנִי is not found at all, and hardly at all in the Talmud. [For details see the *Lexicon*, s. v. אֲנִי and אֲנִי.]

Phoenician, Moabite, and Assyrian, but in no other of the kindred dialects;¹ from the latter the suffixes are derived (§ 33). The *ô* most probably results from an obscuring of an original *â* (cf. Aram. אָנָּה, Arab. 'ána). The pausal form אָנָּה occurs not only with small disjunctive accents, but even with conjunctives; so always in אָנָּה הָ as *I live!* also Is 49¹⁸ with Munah, ψ 119¹²⁵ with Merkha (which, however, has been altered from D^ehî), and twice in Mal 1⁶. In all these cases there is manifestly a disagreement between the vocalization already established and the special laws regulating the system of accentuation.

d 2. The formation of the plural, in this and the other persons, exhibits a certain analogy with that of the noun, while at the same time (like the pronouns of other languages) it is characterized by many differences and peculiarities. The short form אָנָּה (אָנָּה) from which the suffix is derived occurs only in Jer 42⁶ *Kethibh*. The form אָנָּה (cf. § 19 h) only in Ex 167⁸, Nu 32³², La 34²; אָנָּה in *pause*, Gn 42¹¹; in Arabic *nāhnu* is the regular form. In the Mišna אָנָּה (אָנָּה) has altogether supplanted the longer forms.

e 3. The pronoun of the 1st person only is, as a rule in languages, of the common gender, because the person who is present and speaking needs no further indication of gender, as does the 2nd person, who is addressed (in Greek, Latin, English, &c., this distinction is also lacking), and still more the 3rd person who is absent.

II. Second Person.

f 4. The forms of the 2nd person אָתָּה, אָתָּה, אָתָּה, אָתָּה, &c., are contracted from 'antā, &c. The kindred languages have retained the *n* before the ת, e. g. Arab. 'antā, fem. 'anti, thou; pl. 'antum, fem. 'antinnā, ye. In Syriac אָתָּה, fem. אָתָּה are written, but both are pronounced 'at. In Western Aramaic אָתָּה is usual for both genders.

g אָתָּה (without ה) occurs five times, e. g. ψ 64, always as *Kethibh*, with אָתָּה as *Q^erê*. In three places אָתָּה appears as a masculine, Nu 111¹⁶, Dt 5²⁴, Ez 28¹⁴.

h The feminine form was originally אָתָּה as in Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic. This form is found seven times as *Kethibh* (Ju 17², 1 K 14², 2 K 4^{16,23}, 8¹, Jer 4³⁰, Ez 36¹³) and appears also in the corresponding personal ending of verbs (see § 44 f), especially, and necessarily, before suffixes, as אָתָּה אָתָּה, § 59 a [c]; cf. also *i* as the ending of the 2nd fem. sing. of the imperative and imperfect. The final *i* was, however, gradually dropped in pronunciation, just as in Syriac (see above, f) it was eventually only written, not pronounced. The *'* therefore finally disappeared (cf. § 10 k), and hence the Masoretes, even in these seven passages, have pointed the word in the text as אָתָּה to indicate the *Q^erê* אָתָּה (see § 17). The same final *'* appears in the rare (Aramaic) forms of the suffix אָתָּה, אָתָּה (§§ 58, 91).

i 5. The plurals אָתָּה (with the second vowel assimilated to the fem. form) and אָתָּה (אָתָּה), with the tone on the ultima, only partially correspond to the assumed ground-forms 'antumū, fem. 'antinnā, Arab. 'antum (Aram. אָתָּה, אָתָּה) and 'antinnā (Aram. אָתָּה, אָתָּה). The form אָתָּה is found only in Ez 34³¹ (so Qimḥi expressly, others אָתָּה); אָתָּה (for which some MSS. have

¹ In Phoenician and Moabite (inscription of Mēša', line 1) it is written אָתָּה, without the final *'*. In Punic it was pronounced *anec* (Plaut. *Poen.* 5, 1, 8) or *anech* (5, 2, 35). Cf. Schröder, *Phöniz. Sprache*, p. 143. In Assyrian the corresponding form is *anaku*, in old Egyptian *anek*, Coptic *anok*, *nok*.

אֲנִי only four times, viz. Gn 31⁶, Ez 13^{11,10}, 34¹⁷; in 13²⁰ אֲנִי (before מ) is even used as feminine.

III. Third Person.

6. (a) In הוּא and הִיא (*hû* and *hî*) the ׀ (corresponding to the 'Elif of pro-*k* longation in Arabic, cf. § 23 *i*) might be regarded only as an orthographic addition closing the final long vowel, as in הוּא, הִיא, &c. The ׀ is, however, always written in the case of the separate pronouns,¹ and only as a toneless suffix (§ 33 *a*) does הוּא appear as הוּ, while הִיא becomes הִי. In Arabic (as in Syriac) they are written הוּ and הִי but pronounced *hûwā* and *hîyā*, and in Vulgar Arabic even *hûwa* and *hîyya*. This Arabic pronunciation alone would not indeed be decisive, since the vowel complement might have arisen from the more consonantal pronunciation of the ו and י; but the Ethiopic *we'etû* (= *hu'a-tû*) for הוּא, *ye'etî* (= *hî'a-tî*) for הִיא (cf. also the Assyrian *ya-u-a* for הוּא) show that the ׀ was original and indicated an original vocalic termination of the two words. According to Philippi (*ZDMG.* xxviii. 172 and xxix. 371 ff.) הוּא arose from a primitive Semitic *ha-ra*, הִיא from *ha-ya*.

(b) The form הוּא also stands in the consonantal text (*K^ethîbh*) of the *Pentateuch*² (with the exception of eleven places) for the *fem.* הִיא. In all such cases the Masora, by the punctuation הוּא, has indicated the *Q^erê* הִיא (*Q^erê perpetuum*, see § 17). The old explanation regarded this phenomenon as an archaism which was incorrectly removed by the Masoretes. This assumption is, however, clearly untenable, if we consider (1) that no other Semitic language is without the quite indispensable distinction of gender in the separate pronoun of the 3rd pers.; (2) that this distinction does occur eleven times in the *Pentateuch*, and that in Gn 20⁵, 38²⁵, Nu 5^{13,14} הוּא and הִיא are found close to one another; (3) that outside the *Pentateuch* the distinction is found in the oldest documents, so that the הִיא cannot be regarded as having been subsequently adopted from the Aramaic; (4) that those parts of the book of Joshua which certainly formed a constituent part of the original sources of the *Pentateuch*, know nothing of this epicene use of הוּא. Consequently there only remains the hypothesis, that the writing of הוּא for הִיא rests on an orthographical peculiarity which in some recension of the *Pentateuch*-text was almost consistently followed, but was afterwards very properly rejected by the Masoretes. The orthography was, however, peculiar to the *Pentateuch*-text alone, since it is unnecessary to follow the Masora in writing הִיא for הוּא in 1 K 17¹⁵, Is 30³³, Jb 31¹¹, or הוּא for הִיא in ψ 73¹⁶, Ec 5⁸, 1 Ch 29¹⁶. The Samaritan recension of the *Pentateuch* has the correct form in the *K^ethîbh* throughout. Levy's explanation of this strange practice of the Masoretes is evidently right, viz. that originally הוּא was written for both forms (see *k*, note), and was almost everywhere, irrespective of gender, expanded into הוּא. On the whole question see Driver, *Leviticus* (in Haupt's Bible), p. 25 f. In the text Driver always reads הוּא.

7. The plural forms הֵם (הֶמָּה) and הֵנָּה (after prefixes הֵן, הֵן) are of doubtful origin, but הֵם, הֵנָּה have probably been assimilated to הֵנָּה which goes back to a form *hinnā*. In Western Aram. הֵמוֹן, הֵמוֹן, Syr. *henûn*

¹ In the inscription of King Mēša' (see § 2 *d*), lines 6 and 27, we find הוּא for הוּא, and in the inscription of 'Ešmun'azar, line 22, for הִיא, but in the Zenjirli inscriptions (see § 1 *m*) both הוּא and הוּא occur (Hadad i, l. 29).

² Also in twelve places in the Babylonian Codex (Prophets) of 916 A. D.; cf. Baer, *Ezechiel*, p. 108 f.; Buhl, *Canon and Text of the O. T.* (Edinb. 1892), p. 240.

(*enân*), Arab. *himû* (archaic form of *hum*), and Ethiop. *hômû*, an *ô* or *û* is appended, which in Hebrew seems to reappear in the poetical suffixes מוּ—, מוּ—, מוּ— (§ 91 l, 3).

n In some passages הִמָּה stands for the feminine (Zc 5¹⁰, Ct 6⁸, Ru 1²²; cf. the use of the suffix of the 3rd masc. for the 3rd fem., § 135 o and § 145 t). For the quite anomalous עַרְיָהֶם 2 K 9¹⁸ read עַרְיָהֶם (Jb 32¹²).

O 8. The pronouns of the 3rd person may refer to *things* as well as persons. On their meaning as *demonstratives* see § 136.

§ 33. Pronominal Suffixes.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 100 f.; *Grundriss*, i. 306 ff. J. Barth, 'Beiträge zur Suffixlehre des Nordsemit.', in the *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, 1901, p. 193 ff.

a 1. The independent principal forms of the personal pronoun (the *separate pronoun*), given in the preceding section, express only the nominative.¹ The accusative and genitive are expressed by forms, usually shorter, joined to the end of verbs, nouns, and particles (*pronominal suffixes* or simply *suffixes*); e. g. הוּ (toneless) and וּ (from *āhû*) *eum* and *eius*, קָטַלְתִּיהוּ *I have killed him* (also קָטַלְתִּי), קָטַלְתָּהוּ or (with *āhû* contracted into *ô*) קָטַלְתָּו *thou hast killed him*; אֹרְוּ (also אֹרְוֶהוּ) *lux eius*.

The same method is employed in all the other Semitic languages, as well as in the Egyptian, Persian, Finnish, Tartar, and others; in Greek, Latin, and German we find only slight traces of the kind, e. g. German, *er gab's* for *er gab es*; Greek, *πατήρ μου* for *πατήρ ἐμοῦ*; Latin, *eccum*, *eccos*, &c., in Plautus and Terence for *ecce eum*, *ecce eos*.

b 2. The case which these suffixes represent is—

(*a*) When joined to verbs, the accusative (cf., however, § 117 x), e. g. קָטַלְתִּיהוּ *I have killed him*.

c (*b*) When affixed to substantives, the genitive (like *πατήρ μου*, *pater eius*). They then serve as *possessive pronouns*, e. g. אָבִי ('*ābh-î*) *my father*, סוּסוֹ *his horse*, which may be either *equus eius* or *equus suus*.

d (*c*) When joined to particles, either the genitive or accusative, according as the particles originally expressed the idea of a noun or a verb, e. g. בֵּינִי, literally *interstitium mei*, *between me* (cf. *mea causa*); but הִנְנִי *behold me*, *ecce me*.

e (*d*) Where, according to the Indo-Germanic case-system, the dative or ablative of the pronoun is required, the suffixes in Hebrew are joined to prepositions expressing those cases (לְ sign of the dative, בְּ *in*, מִן *from*, § 102), e. g. לוֹ *to him (ei)* and *to himself (sibi)*, בוֹ *in him*, מִנִּי (usually מֵנִי) *from me*.

¹ On apparent exceptions see § 135 d.

3. The suffixes of the 2nd person (ךָ, &c.) are all formed with *f* a *k*-sound, not, like the *separate* pronouns of the 2nd person, with a *t*-sound.

So in all the Semitic languages, in Ethiopic even in the verbal form (*qatalka, thou hast killed* = Hebr. קָטַלְתָּךְ).

4. The *suffix of the verb* (the accusative) and the *suffix of the noun* (the *g* genitive) coincide in most forms, but some differ, e. g. מִי — *me*, מִי — *my*.

Paradigm A at the end of the Grammar gives a table of all the forms of the *separate pronoun* and the *suffixes*; a fuller treatment of the *verbal suffix* and the mode of attaching it to the verb will be found in § 58 ff., of the *noun-suffix* in § 91, of the *prepositions with suffixes* in § 103, of *adverbs with suffixes* § 100 o.

§ 34. The Demonstrative Pronoun.

1. *Sing.* { *m.* הַזֶּה¹
f. הַזֹּאת (הִיא, הִיא)² } *this.* *Plur. com.* אֵלֶּה (rarely אֵלָּה) *these. a*

Rem. 1. The feminine form הַזֹּאת has undoubtedly arisen from הַזֹּאת, by *b* obscuring of an original *ā* to *ô* (for הַזֹּאת = הַזֶּה cf. the Arab. *hā-dā, this, masc.*; for *ā* as the feminine ending, § 80), and the forms הִיא, הִיא, both of which are rare,³ are shortened from הַזֹּאת. In ψ 132¹² הִיא is used as a *relative*, cf. הִיא below. In Jer 26⁶, *Keṯibh*, הַזֹּאתָה (with the article and the demonstrative termination הַזֹּאת) is found for הַזֹּאת. The forms אֵלֶּה and אֵלָּה are the plurals of הַזֶּה and הַזֹּאת by usage, though not etymologically. The form אֵלָּה occurs only in the Pentateuch (but not in the Samaritan text), Gn 19^{8,25}, 26^{3,4}, &c. (8 times), always with the article, הָאֵלָּה [as well as אֵלָּה, הָאֵלָּה frequently], and in 1 Ch 2c⁸ without the article [cf. Driver on Dt 4⁴²].⁴ Both the singular and the plural may refer to things as well as persons.

2. In combination with prepositions to denote the oblique case we find הַזֶּה *C* to *this* (cf. for הַזֶּה, § 102 g), הַזֹּאת, הַזֹּאת to *this* (fem.), הָאֵלֶּה, הָאֵלָּה to *these*; הַזֶּה *hunc*, הַזֹּאת *hanc*, הָאֵלֶּה *hos*, also without הַזֶּה, even before the verb ψ 75⁸, &c. Note also הַזֶּה מִחִיר *pretium huius* (1 K 21²), &c.

¹ In many languages the demonstratives begin with a *d*-sound (hence called the *demonstrative sound*) which, however, sometimes interchanges with a sibilant. Cf. Aram. הַזֶּה, הַזֶּה *masc.*, הַזֶּה, הַזֶּה *fem.* (this); Sansk. *sa, sā, tat*; Gothic *sa, sô, thata*; Germ. *da, der, die, das*; and Eng. *the, this, that*, &c. Cf. J. Barth, 'Zum semit. Demonstr. *ā*,' in ZDMG. 59, 159 ff., and 633 ff.; Sprachwiss. Untersuchungen zum Semit., Lpz. 1907, p. 30 ff. [See the Lexicon, s. v. הַזֶּה, and Aram. הַזֶּה, הַזֶּה.]

² That הַזֶּה may stand for the feminine, cannot be proved either from Ju 16²⁸ or from the certainly corrupt passage in Jos 2¹⁷.

³ הַזֶּה 2 K 6¹⁹, and in seven other places; הִיא only in Hos 7¹⁶, ψ 132¹².

⁴ According to Kuenen (cf. above, § 2 n) and Driver, on Lev 18²⁷ in Haupt's Bible, this אֵלָּה is due to an error of the punctuators. It goes back to a time when the vowel of the second syllable was not yet indicated by a vowel letter, and later copyists wrongly omitted the addition of the ה. In Phœnician also it was written אֵלָּה, but pronounced *ily* according to Plautus, *Paen.* v, 1, 9.

- d* 2. The secondary form ה occurs only in poetic style, and mostly for the relative, like our *that* for *who* [see Lexicon, s.v.]. Like אֵשֶׁר (§ 36), it serves for all numbers and genders.
- e* Rem. 1. This pronoun takes the article (הַ, הָ, הֵּ, הֶּ) according to the same rule as adjectives, see § 126 u; e.g. הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה *this man*, but הַאִישׁ הַזֶּה *this is the man*.
- f* 2. Rarer secondary forms, with strengthened demonstrative force, are הַלְלוּהָ Gn 24⁶⁵, 37¹⁹; הַלְלוּ *fem.* Ez 36³⁵; and shortened הֵלֹ, sometimes *masc.*, as in Ju 6²⁰, 1 S 17²⁶, 2 K 23¹⁷, Zc 2⁸, Dn 8¹⁶, sometimes *fem.*, 2 K 4²⁵: cf. 1 S 14¹ [and 20¹⁹ LXX; see Commentaries and Kittel].
- g* 3. The personal pronouns of the 3rd person also often have a demonstrative sense, see § 136.

§ 35. The Article.

J. Barth, 'Der heb. u. der aram. Artikel,' in *Sprachwiss. Untersuch. zum Semit.*, Lpz. 1907, p. 47 ff.

- a* 1. The article, which is by nature a kind of demonstrative pronoun, never appears in Hebrew as an independent word, but always in closest connexion with the word which is defined by it. It usually takes the form הַ, with *ā* and a strengthening of the next consonant, e.g. הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ *the sun*, הַיָּאֵר *the river*, הַלְוִיִּים *the Levites* (according to § 20 m for הַיָּאֵר, הַלְוִיִּים).
- b* Rem. With regard to the Dageš in הַ after the article, the rule is, that it is inserted when a ה or ו follows the ה, e.g. הַיהוּדִים *the Jews*, הַיָּעִפִּים *the weary* (פְּיָעִינִים La 4³ Qerē is an exception), but הַיָּאֵר, הַיָּלְדִים, הַיָּסוּר, &c. Dageš forte also stands after the article in the prefix מַ in certain nouns and in the participles *Pi'al* and *Pu'al* (see § 52 c) before ה, ו and ר, except when the guttural (or ר) has under it a short vowel in a sharpened syllable; thus הַמְּוֹקָה Ez 22⁵, הַמְּעָרָה *the cave*, הַמְּרַעִים ψ 37¹ (cf. Jb 38⁴⁰, 1 Ch 4⁴¹); but הַמְּחִיָּה ψ 104³ (Ec 4¹⁵, 2 Ch 23¹²; before ו ψ 103⁴); הַמְּעַשָּׂה Is 23¹²; הַמְּרַנְּלִים Jos 6²². Before letters other than gutturals this מַ remains without Dageš, according to § 20 m.
- c* 2. When the article stands before a guttural, which (according to § 22 b) cannot properly be strengthened, the following cases arise, according to the character of the guttural (cf. § 27 q).
- (1) In the case of the weakest guttural, א, and also with ר (§ 22 c and q), the strengthening is altogether omitted. Consequently, the *Pathah* of the article (since it stands in an open syllable) is always lengthened to *Qames*; e.g. הָאָב *the father*, הָאַחֵר *the other*, הָאִם *the mother*, הָאִישׁ *the man*, הָאֹר *the light*, הָאֱלֹהִים ὁ θεός, הָרֵגֶל *the foot*, הָרֹאשׁ *the head*, הָרָשָׁע *the wicked*.
- d* So also הַשְּׂפֹת Neh 3¹³, because syncopated from הַשְּׂפֹת (cf. verse 14 and Baer on the passage); הָאֲנָקִים (as in Nu 11⁴, Ju 9⁴¹, 2 S 23³³, with the א

orthographically retained, for הָאֵלֹהִים Jer 40⁴ (cf. בָּאֵלֹהִים verse 1); הַסִּימִיּוֹת Ec 4¹⁴ for הָאֵסִימִיּוֹת; הַרְמִיּוֹת 2 Ch 22⁵ for הָאֲרָרִי (cf. 2 K 8²⁸).

(2) In the case of the other gutturals either the virtual strengthening takes place (§ 22 c)—especially with the stronger sounds ה and ח, less often with ע—or the strengthening is wholly omitted. In the former case, the *Pathah* of the article remains, because the syllable is still regarded as closed; in the second case, the *Pathah* is either modified to *S^eghôl* or fully lengthened to *Qames*. That is to say:—

A. When the guttural has any other vowel than \bar{a} (ֶ) or \bar{o} (ֹ), *f* then

(1) before the stronger sounds ה and ח the article regularly remains ה; e.g. הַחֹהַל *that*, הַחֹדֶשׁ *the month*, הַחֵיל *the force*, הַחֲכָמָה *the wisdom*. Before ח, \bar{a} occurs only in הַחֵי Gn 6¹⁹ [not elsewhere], הַחֲרִיטִים Is 3²², הַחֲמִינִי Is 17⁸ [not elsewhere]; before ה, always in הַהֶמֶה, הַהֵם.

(2) before ע the *Pathah* is generally lengthened to *Qames*, e.g. הָעַיִן *the eye*, הָעִיר *the city*, הָעֶבֶר *the servant*, plur. הָעֶבְרִים; 1 K 12²²; also in Gn 10¹⁷ הָעֶרְקִי is the better reading. Exceptions are הָעוֹפֶרֶת Ex 15¹⁰, הָעוֹרִים 2 S 5^{6,8}, Is 42¹⁸, הָעֶבֶר Is 24², הָעֶרְבִים Is 65¹¹, הָעֵשֶׂק Ez 22⁷, הָעוֹבִים Pr 2¹³ and הָעוֹבֶת Pr 2¹⁷, הָעֵינִים 1 S 16⁷, Ec 11⁷; but הָעֵינִי Gn 3⁶, Pr 10²⁶. Cf. Baer on Is 42¹⁸.

B. When the guttural has \bar{a} (ֶ) then

h

(1) immediately before a tone-bearing ה or ע the article is always ה, otherwise it is הֶ; e.g. הָעָם *the people*, הָהָר *the mountain*, הָעַיִן (in pause) *the eye*, הָהָרָה *towards the mountain*; but (according to § 22 c) הָהָרִים *the mountains*, הָעַיִן *the iniquity*.

(2) before ה the article is invariably ה without regard to the tone; i.e.g. הָחָכָם *the wise man*, הָחֵג *the festival*.

C. When the guttural has ֶ the article is ה before ה; e.g. הַחֲרָבוֹת *the months*; הַחֲרָבוֹת in the waste places (without the article הַחֲרָבוֹת *bôh^orābhôth*) Ez 33²⁷, הַחֲרָבוֹת Ez 36^{35,38}, cf. 2 Ch 27⁴; but ה before ע, as הָעֵמֶרִים *the sheaves* Ru 2¹⁵.

The gender and number of the noun have no influence on the form of the article.

Rem. 1. The original form of the Hebrew (and the Phoenician) article הֶ *l* is generally considered to have been הֶל, the ל of which (owing to the proclitic nature of the article) has been invariably assimilated to the following consonant, as in יִקָּח from *yūqah*, § 19 d. This view was supported by the form of the Arabic article هَل (pronounced *hal* by some modern Beduin), the ل of which is also assimilated at least before all letters like *s* and *t* and before *l*, *n*, and *r*, e.g. 'al-qur'ān but 'as-sānā (Beduin *has-sana*) = Hebr. הַשָּׁנָה *the year*.

But Barth (*Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, 1896, p. 7 ff.), following Hupfeld and Stade, has shown that the Hebrew article is to be connected rather with the original Semitic demonstrative *hā*,¹ cf. Arab. *hāda*, Aram. *hādēn*, &c. The sharpening of the following consonant is to be explained exactly like the sharpening after ׀ consecutive (§ 49 f; cf. also cases like בָּמָה, בָּמָה, &c., § 102 k), from the close connexion of the *ha* with the following word, and the sharpening necessarily involved the shortening of the vowel.²

m The Arabic article is supposed to occur in the Old Testament in אֱלֹהִים 1 K 10^{11,12} (also אֱלֹהִים 2 Ch 27^{9-10,11}), *sandal-wood* (?), and in אֱלִיבִישׁ hail, ice = גִּבְשִׁי (Arab. *gibs*) Ez 13^{11,13}, 38²², but this explanation can hardly be correct. On the other hand, in the proper name אֱלִמוֹדָר Gn 10²⁶ the first syllable is probably אֵל *God*, as suggested by D. H. Müller (see *Lexicon*, s. v.) and Nöldeke, *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.*, 1882, p. 1186. אֱלִיקִים Pr 30³¹, commonly explained as = Arab. *al-qaum*, the militia, is also quite uncertain.

n 2. When the prefixes בּ, ל, פּ (§ 102) come before the article, the ה is elided, and its vowel is thrown back to the prefix, in the place of the Š-wā (§ 19 k, and § 23 k), e. g. בִּשְׁמַיִם in the heaven for בְּהַשְׁמַיִם (so ψ 36⁶); לָעָם for לְהָעָם to the people, בְּהָרִים on the mountains, בְּחַדָּשִׁים in the months; also in Is 41², read בְּעֶפֶר instead of the impossible בְּעֶפֶר. Exceptions to this rule occur almost exclusively in the later Books: Ez 40²⁵, 47²², Ec 8¹, Dn 8¹⁶, Neh 9¹⁹, 12⁸³, 2 Ch 10⁷, 25¹⁰, 29²⁷; cf., however, 1 S 13²¹, 2 S 21²⁰. Elsewhere, e. g. 2 K 7¹², the Masora requires the elision in the Q^{re}. A distinction in meaning is observed between בְּהַיּוֹם about this time (Gn 39¹¹, 1 S 9¹³, &c.) and בְּיוֹם first of all (Gn 25³¹, &c.). After the copula ו (and) elision of the ה does not take place, e. g. וְהָעָם.

o 3. The words אֲרֶץ earth, הָר mountain, חַג feast, עַם people, פָּר bull, always appear after the article with a long vowel (as in *pause*); הָאָרֶץ, הָהָר, הַחַג, הָעָם, הַפָּר; cf. also אֲרוֹן ark (so in the absol. st. in 2 K 12¹⁰, 2 Ch 24⁸, but to be read אֲרוֹן), with the article always הָאֲרוֹן.

§ 36. The Relative Pronoun.

The relative pronoun (cf. § 138) is usually the indeclinable אֲשֶׁר (*who, which, &c.*), originally a demonstrative pronoun; see further §§ 138 and 155. In the later books, especially Eccles. and the late Psalms, also Lam. (4 times), Jon. (1⁷), Chron. (twice), Ezra (once),—and always in the Canticle (cf. also Ju 7¹², 8²⁶, 2 K 6¹¹), אֲשֶׁ is used instead; more rarely אֲשֶׁ Ju 5⁷, Ct 1⁷ (Jb 19²⁹?); once אֲשֶׁ before א Ju 6¹⁷ (elsewhere אֲשֶׁ before a guttural), before ה even אֲשֶׁ Ec 3¹⁸, and according to some (e. g. Qimhi) also in Ec 2²².³ [See *Lexicon*, s. v.]

¹ An original form *han*, proposed by Ungnad, 'Der hebr. Art.,' in *OLZ.* x (1907), col. 210 f., and *ZDMG.* 1908, p. 80 ff., is open to grave objections.

² In the Lihyanitic inscriptions collected by Euting (ed. by D. H. Müller in *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Arabien*, Wien, 1889) the article is ה, and also in a North Arabian dialect, according to E. Littmann, *Safa-inschriften*, p. 2, Rem., and p. 34.

³ The full form אֲשֶׁר does not occur in Phoenician, but only אֲשֶׁ (= אֲשֶׁ?), pronounced *asse, esse* (also *as, es, is, ys, us*), or—especially in the later Punic

§ 37. *The Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns.*

1. The interrogative pronoun is **מִי** *who?* (of persons, even before *a* plurals, Gn 33⁵, Is 60⁸, 2 K 18³⁶, and sometimes also of things Gn 33⁸, Ju 13¹⁷, Mi 1⁵; cf. also **בֵּת-מִי** *whose daughter?* Gn 24²⁸; **לְמִי** *to whom?* **אֶת-מִי** *whom?*)—**מָה**, **מַה** (see *b*) *what?* (of things).—**אֵי-יָדָה** *which? what?*

The form **מָה**, **מַה**, &c. (followed by *Dageš forte conjunct.*: even in **י**, Hb 2¹, &c., *b* against § 20 *m*) may be explained (like the art. **הַ** § 35 *l*, and **וְ** in the *imperf.* *consec.*) from the rapid utterance of the interrogative in connexion with the following word. Most probably, however, the *Dageš forte* is rather due to the assimilation of an originally audible **ה** (**מֶה**, as Olshausen), which goes back through the intermediate forms *math*, *mat* to an original *mant*: so W. Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, Cambridge, 1890, p. 124, partly following Böttcher, *Hebräische Grammatik*, § 261. A ground-form *mant* would most easily explain **מָן** (*what?*), used in Ex 16¹⁵ in explanation of **מָן** *manna*, while **מִן** is the regular Aramaic for *who*. Socin calls attention to the Arabic *mah* (in pause with an audible *h*: *Mufasssal*, 193, 8). Observe further that—

(*a*) In the closest connexion, by means of *Maqqeph*, **מַה** takes a following *c* *Dageš* (§ 20 *d*), e.g. **מַה-לָּךְ** *what is it to thee?* and even in *one* word, as **מַלְכֶם** *what is it to you?* Is 3¹⁵; cf. Ex 4², Mal 1¹⁸, and even before a guttural, **מַהֶם** Ez 8⁶ *Kethibh*.

(*b*) Before gutturals in close connexion, by means of *Maqqeph* or (e.g. Ju 14¹⁸, 1 S 20¹) a conjunctive accent, either **מַה** is used with a virtual strengthening of the guttural (§ 22 *c*), so especially before **ה**, and, in Gn 31³⁶, Jb 21²¹, before **ח**—or the doubling is wholly omitted. In the latter case either (cf. § 35 *e-k*) *ā* is fully lengthened to *Qames* (so always before the **ה** of the article, except in Ec 2¹²; also before **הֶמָּה**, **הֵמָּה**, and Hb 2¹⁸ before **ע**, Gn 31³², 2 K 8¹³ before **ס** and **ר**) or modified to *Sēghōl*, especially before **ע**, **ח**, and generally before **ה**. The omission of the strengthening also takes place as a rule with **ה**, **ח**, **ע**, when they have not *Qames*, and then the form is either **מַה** or **מָה**, the latter especially before **ח** or **ע**, if *Maqqeph* follows.

The longer forms **מָה** and **מַה** are also used (**מָה** even before letters which are not gutturals) when not connected by *Maqqeph* but only by a *conjunctive accent*. As a rule **מָה** is then used, but sometimes **מַה** when at a greater distance from the principal tone of the sentence, Is 1⁵, ψ 4³. (On **מָה** in the combinations **בְּמָה**, **בְּמָה**, and even **לְמָה**, 1 S 1⁸, cf. § 102 *k* and *l*.)

(*c*) In the principal pause **מָה** is used without exception; also as a rule with the smaller *disjunctives*, and almost always before gutturals (**מַה** only in very few cases). On the other hand, **מָה** more often stands before letters which are not gutturals, when at a greater distance from the principal tone of the sentence, e.g. 1 S 4⁶, 15¹⁴, 2 K 1⁷, Hag 1⁹ (see Köhler on the passage), ψ 10¹³, Jb 7²¹; cf., however, Pr 31², and Delitzsch on the passage.

2. On **מִי** and **מַה** as indefinite pronouns in the sense of *quicunque*, *g quodcunque*, and as relatives, *is qui*, *id quod*, &c., see § 137 *c*.

and in the *Poenulus* of Plautus—**ש** (*sa, si, sy, su*). Also in New Hebrew **שִׁי** has become the common form. Cf. Schröder, *Phön. Sprache*, p. 162 ff. and below, § 155; also Bergsträsser, 'Das hebr. Präfix **ש**,' in *ZAW.* 1909, p. 40 ff.

CHAPTER II

THE VERB

§ 38. General View.

a Verbal stems are either original or derived. They are usually divided into—

- (*a*) Verbal stems proper (*primitive verbs*), which exhibit the stem without any addition, e.g. מָלַךְ *he has reigned*.
b (*b*) *Verbal derivatives*, i.e. *secondary* verbal stems, derived from the pure stem (letter *a*), e.g. קָדַשׁ *to sanctify*, הִתְקַדַּשׁ *to sanctify oneself*, from קָדַשׁ *to be holy*. These are usually called *conjugations* (§ 39).
c (*c*) *Denominatives*,¹ i.e. verbs derived from nouns (like the Latin *causari*, *praedari*, and Eng. *to skin*, *to stone*), or even from particles (see *d*, end) either in a primitive or derivative form, e.g. אָהַל, *Qal* and פִּיֵּל, *to pitch a tent*, from אָהַל *tent*; וְשָׂרַשׁ and שָׂרַשׁ *to take root*, and שָׂרַשׁ *to root out*, from שָׂרַשׁ *root* (§ 52 *h*).

d This does not exclude the possibility that, for nouns, from which denominative verbs are derived, the corresponding (original) verbal stem may still be found either in Hebrew or in the dialects. The meaning, however, is sufficient to show that the denominatives have come from the noun, not from the verbal stem, e.g. לָבֵן *a brick* (verbal stem לָבַן *to be white*), denomin. לָבַן *to make bricks*; דָּג *a fish* (verbal stem דָּגַה *to be prolific*), denomin. דָּגַג *to fish*; חָרַף *to winter* (from חָרַף *autumn, winter*, stem חָרַף *to pluck*); קָיַן *to pass the summer* (from קָיַן *summer*, stem קָיַן *to be hot*).

On 'Semitic verbs derived from particles' see P. Haupt in the *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, xxii (1906), 257 ff.

§ 39. Ground-form and Derived Stems.

Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 119 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 504 ff.

a 1. The 3rd sing. masc. of the *Perfect* in the form of the pure stem (i.e. in *Qal*, see *e*) is generally regarded, lexicographically and grammatically, as the ground-form of the verb (§ 30 *a*), e.g. קָטַל *he has killed*, כָּבֵד *he was heavy*, קָטַן *he was little*.² From this form the other

¹ Cf. W. J. Gerber, *Die hebr. Verba denom.*, insbes. im theol. Sprachgebr. des A. T., Lpz. 1896.

² For the sake of brevity, however, the meaning in Hebrew-English Lexicons is usually given in the Infinitive, e.g. לָמַד *to learn*, properly *he has learnt*.

persons of the *Perfect* are derived, and the *Participle* also is connected with it. קָטַל or קָטֵל, like the Imperative and Infinitive construct in sound, may also be regarded as an alternative ground-form, with which the Imperfect (see § 47) is connected.

In verbs וָע"ל (i.e. with ו for their second radical) the stem-form, given both *b* in *Lexicon* and *Grammar*, is not the 3rd sing. masc. Perfect (consisting of two consonants), but the form with medial ו, which appears in the Imperative and Infinitive; e. g. שָׁבַע to return (3rd pers. perf. שָׁבַע): the same is the case in most stems with medial ו, e. g. דָּיַן to judge.

2. From the pure stem, or *Qal*, the derivative stems are formed *c* according to an unvarying analogy, in which the idea of the stem assumes the most varied shades of meaning, according to the changes in its form (intensive, frequentative, privative, causative, reflexive, reciprocal; some of them with corresponding passive forms), e. g. לָמַד to learn, לָמַר to teach; שָׁבַע to lie, הִשְׁבִּיעַ to lay; שָׁפַט to judge, נִשְׁפָּט to contend. In other languages such formations are regarded as new or *derivative verbs*, e. g. Germ. *fallen* (to fall), *fällen* (to fell); *trinken* (to drink), *tränken* (to drench); Lat. *lactere* (to suck, Germ. *saugen*), *lactare* (to suckle, Germ. *säugen*); *iacere* (to throw), *iacere* (to lie down); γίνομαι, γεννάω. In Hebrew, however, these formations are incomparably more regular and systematic than (e. g.) in Greek, Latin, or English; and, since the time of Reuchlin, they have usually been called *conjugations* of the primitive form (among the Jewish grammarians בְּנֵי יָסֵד, i. e. *formations*, or more correctly *species*), and are always treated together in the grammar and lexicon.¹

3. The changes in the primitive form consist either in internal *d* modification by means of vowel-change and strengthening of the middle consonant (קָטַל, קָטַל; קָטַל, קָטַל; cf. to lie, to lay; to fall, to fell), or in the repetition of one or two of the stem-consonants (קָטַל, קָטַל), or finally in the introduction of formative additions (נִקְטַל), which may also be accompanied by internal change (הִתְקַטַּל, הִתְקַטַּל). Cf. § 31 b.

In Aramaic the formation of the conjugations is effected more by formative additions than by vowel-change. The vocalic distinctions have mostly become obsolete, so that, e. g. the reflexives with the prefix הִתְ, הִתְ, הִתְ have entirely usurped the place of the passives. On the other hand, Arabic has preserved great wealth in both methods of formation, while Hebrew in this, as in other respects, holds the middle place (§ 1 m).

4. Grammarians differ as to the *number* and *arrangement* of these *c* conjugations. The common practice, however, of calling them by the

¹ The term *Conjugation* thus has an entirely different meaning in Hebrew and Greek or Latin grammar.

old grammatical terms, prevents any misunderstanding. The simple form is called *Qal* (קָל *light*, because it has no formative additions); the others (כִּבְרִים *heavy*, being weighted, as it were, with the strengthening of consonants or with formative additions) take their names from the paradigm of פָּעַל *he has done*,¹ which was used in the earliest Jewish grammatical works. Several of these have passives which are distinguished from their actives by more obscure vowels. The common conjugations (including *Qal* and the passives) are the seven following, but very few verbs exhibit them all:

	Active.	Passive.
<i>f</i> 1. <i>Qal</i>	קָטַל <i>to kill</i> .	(Cf. § 52 <i>e</i> .)
2. <i>Niph'al</i>	נִקְטַל <i>to kill oneself</i> (rarely passive).	
3. <i>Pi'el</i>	קָטַל <i>to kill many, to massacre</i> .	4. <i>Pu'al</i> קָטַל.
5. <i>Hiph'il</i>	הִקְטִיל <i>to cause to kill</i> .	6. <i>Hoph'al</i> הִקְטִיל.
7. <i>Hithpa'el</i>	הִתְקַטַּל <i>to kill oneself</i> . [Very rare, <i>Hothpa'al</i> הִתְקַטַּל.]	

g There are besides several less frequent conjugations, some of which, however, are more common in the kindred languages, and even in Hebrew (in the weak verb) regularly take the place of the usual conjugations (§ 55).

In Arabic there is a greater variety of conjugations, and their arrangement is more appropriate. According to the Arabic method, the Hebrew conjugations would stand thus: 1. *Qal*; 2. *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*; 3. *Pō'el* and *Pō'al* (see § 55 *b*); 4. *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*; 5. *Hithpa'el* and *Hothpa'al*; 6. *Hithpō'el* (see § 55 *b*); 7. *Niph'al*; 8. *Hithpa'el* (see § 54 *l*); 9. *Pi'el* (see § 55 *d*). A more satisfactory division would be into three classes: (1) The intensive *Pi'el* with the derived and analogous forms *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el*. (2) The causative *Hiph'il* with its passive *Hoph'al*, and the analogous forms (*Šaph'el* and *Tiph'el*). (3) The reflexive or passive *Niph'al*.

¹ This paradigm was borrowed from the Arabic grammarians, and, according to Bacher, probably first adopted throughout by Abulwalid. It was, however, unsuitable on account of the guttural, and was, therefore, usually exchanged in later times for פָּקַד, after the example of Moses Qimḥi. This verb has the advantage, that all its conjugations are actually found in the Old Testament. On the other hand, it has the disadvantage of indistinctness in the pronunciation of some of its forms, e.g. פָּקַדְתָּם, פָּקַדְתָּ. The paradigm of קָטַל, commonly used since the time of Danz, avoids this defect, and is especially adapted for the comparative treatment of the Semitic dialects, inasmuch as it is found with slight change (Arab. and Ethiop. קָטַל) in all of them. It is true that in Hebrew it occurs only three times in *Qal*, and even then only in poetic style (ψ 139¹⁹, Jb 13¹⁵, 24¹⁴); yet it is worth retaining as a model which has been sanctioned by usage. More serious is the defect, that a number of forms of the paradigm of קָטַל leave the beginner in doubt as to whether or not there should be a *Dageš* in the *Bēgadkephath* letters, and consequently as to the correct division of the syllables.

§ 40. Tenses. Moods. Flexion.

A. Ungnad, 'Die gegenseitigen Beziehungen der Verbalformen im Grundstamm des semit. Verbs,' in *ZDMG.* 59 (1905), 766 ff., and his 'Zum hebr. Verbalsystem', in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* ed. by Fr. Delitzsch and P. Haupt, 1907, p. 55 ff.

1. While the Hebrew verb, owing to these derivative forms or *a* conjugations, possesses a certain richness and copiousness, it is, on the other hand, poor in the matter of *tenses* and *moods*. The verb has only two *tense*-forms (*Perfect* and *Imperfect*, see the note on § 47 a), besides an *Imperative* (but only in the active), two *Infinitives* and a *Participle*. All relations of time, absolute and relative, are expressed either by these forms (hence a certain diversity in their meaning, § 106 ff.) or by syntactical combinations. Of moods properly so called (besides the *Imperfect Indicative* and *Imperative*), only the *Jussive* and *Optative* are sometimes indicated by express modifications of the *Imperfect*-form (§ 48).

2. The *inflexion* of the *Perfect*, *Imperfect*, and *Imperative* as to *b* persons, differs from that of the Western languages in having, to a great extent, distinct forms for the two genders, which correspond to the different forms of the *personal pronoun*. It is from the union of the pronoun with the verbal stem that the personal inflexions of these tenses arise.

The following table will serve for the beginner as a provisional *c* scheme of the formative syllables (*affirmatives* and *preformatives*) of the two *tenses*. The three stem-consonants of the strong verb are denoted by dots. Cf. § 44 ff. and the Paradigms.

PERFECT.

Singular.				Plural.			
3. m.	.	.	.	3. c.	ָ	.	.
3. f.	הַ	.	.				
2. m.	תָּ	.	.	2. m.	תָּם	.	.
2. f.	תָּ	.	.	2. f.	תָּן	.	.
1. c.	תִּי	.	.	1. c.	נִי	.	.

IMPERFECT.

Singular.				Plural.			
3. m.	.	.	ִי	3. m.	ִי	.	.
3. f.	.	.	תִּי	3. f.	נָהּ	.	תִּי
2. m.	.	.	תִּי	2. m.	ִי	.	תִּי
2. f.	ִי	.	תִּי	2. f.	נָהּ	.	תִּי
1. c.	.	.	נִי	1. c.	.	.	נִי

§ 41. Variations from the Ordinary Form of the Strong Verb.

a The same laws which are normally exhibited in stems with strong (unchangeable) consonants, hold good for all other verbs. Deviations from the model of the strong verb are only modifications due to the special character or weakness of certain consonants, viz. :—

(a) When one of the stem-consonants (or *radicals*) is a guttural. In this case, however, the variations only occur in the vocalization (according to § 22), not in the consonants. The *guttural verbs* (§§ 62–65) are, therefore, only a variety of the *strong verb*.

b (b) When a stem-consonant (*radical*) disappears by assimilation (§ 19 b-f), or when the stem originally consisted of only two consonants (*verbs* י"ב, ע"ע, and י"ע, as שָׁבַע, קָם, §§ 66, 67, 72).

c (c) When one of the stem-consonants (*radicals*) is a weak letter. In this case, through aphaeresis, elision, &c., of the weak consonant, various important deviations from the regular form occur. Cf. § 68 ff. for these verbs, such as יָשַׁב, כָּצַח, גָּלָה.

d Taking the old paradigm לָעַב as a model, it is usual, following the example of the Jewish grammarians, to call the first radical of any stem ב, the second ע, and the third ל. Hence the expressions, *verb* א"ב for a verb whose first radical is א (*primae radicalis* [sc. *literae*] א); י"ע for *mediae radicalis* י; ע"ע for a verb whose second radical is repeated to form a third.

I. The Strong Verb.

§ 42.

As the formation of the strong verb is the model also for the weak verb, a statement of the general formative laws should precede the treatment of special cases.

Paradigm B, together with the Table of the personal preformatives and affirmatives given in § 40 c, offers a complete survey of the normal forms. A full explanation of them is given in the following sections (§§ 43–55), where each point is elucidated on its first occurrence; thus e.g. the inflexion of the Perfect, the Imperfect and its modifications, will be found under Qal, &c.

A. THE PURE STEM, OR QAL.

§ 43. Its Form and Meaning.

a The common form of the 3rd sing. masc. of the *Perfect Qal* is קָם, with *ā* (*Pathah*) in the second syllable, especially in *transitive verbs* (but see § 44 c). There is also a form with *ē* (*Šere*, originally *ī*), and another with *ō* (*Holem*, originally *ū*) in the second syllable, both of which, however, have almost always an *intransitive*¹ meaning,

¹ But cf. such instances as Jer 48⁵. In Arabic also, transitive verbs are found with middle *ī*, corresponding to Hebrew verbs with *ē* in the second

and serve to express states and qualities, e.g. *כָּבֵד* to be heavy, *קָטַן* to be small.

In Paradigm B a verb *middle a*, a verb *middle ē*, and a verb *middle ō* are accordingly given side by side. The second example *כָּבֵד* is chosen as showing, at the same time, when the *Dageš lene* is to be inserted or omitted.

Rem. 1. The vowel of the second syllable is the principal vowel, and hence on it depends the distinction between the transitive and intransitive meaning. The *Qameš* of the first syllable is lengthened from an original *ā* (cf. Arabic *qātūlā*), but it can be retained in Hebrew only immediately before the tone, or at the most (with an open ultima) in the counter-tone with *Metheg*; otherwise, like all the pretonic vowels (*ā, ē*), it becomes *Šewā*, e. g. *קָטַלְתָּם* 2nd plur. masc. In the Aramaic dialects the vowel of the first syllable is always reduced to *Šewā*, as *קָטַל* = Hebr. *קָטַל*. The intransitive forms in Arabic are *qātūlā, qātūlū*; in Hebrew (after the rejection of the final vowel) *i* being in the tone-syllable has been regularly lengthened to *ē*, and *ū* to *ō*.

2. Examples of *denominatives* in *Qal* are: *חָמַר* to cover with pitch, from *חָמַר* C pitch; *מָלַח* to salt, from *מָלַח* salt; *נָשַׁבַר* (usually *Hiph.*) to buy or sell corn, from *נָשַׁבַר* corn; see above, § 38 c.

§ 44. *Flexion of the Perfect of Qal.*¹

1. The formation of the persons of the Perfect is effected by the *a* addition of certain forms of the personal pronoun, and marks of the 3rd fem. sing. and 3rd pl. (as *affirmatives*) to the end of the verbal-stem, which contains the idea of a predicate, and may be regarded, in meaning if not in form, as a *Participle* or *verbal adjective*. For the 3rd pers. sing. masc. Perfect, the pronominal or subject idea inherent in the finite verb is sufficient: thus, *קָטַל* he has killed, *קָטַלְתָּ* thou hast killed (as it were, *killing thou*, or *a killer thou*), *קָטַלְתָּ* thou = *קָטַלְתָּ*; *יָרָא* he was fearing, *יָרְאוּ* ye were fearing = *יָרְאוּ*. The ending of the 1st pers. plur. (—נִי) is also certainly connected with the termination of *אֲנִי*, *אֲנִי* we (§ 32 b, d). The affirmative of the 1st pers. sing. (—נִי) is to be referred, by an interchange of *כ* and *ת* (cf. § 33 f), to that form of the pronoun which also underlies *אֲנִי*, I.² In the third person *הָ* (originally *הָ*—, cf. below, f) is the mark of the feminine, as in a great number of nouns (§ 80 c), and *וּ* is the termination of the plural; cf., for the latter, the termination of the 3rd and 2nd pers. plur. Imperf. *ūna* in Arabic and *ū* (often also *ī*)

syllable. Hence P. Haupt (*Proc. Amer. Or. Soc.*, 1894, p. ci f.) prefers to distinguish them as *verba voluntaria* (actions which depend on the will of the subject) and *involuntaria* (actions or states independent of the will of the subject).

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, 'Die Endungen des Perfects' (*Untersuchungen zur semit. Gramm.* ii.), in *ZDMG.* vol. 38, p. 407 ff., and more fully in *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb. 1904, p. 15 ff.

² According to Nöldeke, *l.c.*, p. 419, the original Semitic termination of the 1st sing. Perf. was most probably *kū*; cf. the Ethiopic *qatalku*, Arabic *qatalu*.

in Hebrew, also *una* (in the construct state *u*) as the plural termination of masc. nouns in literary Arabic.

b 2. The characteristic *Pathah* of the second syllable becomes *Šewā* before an affirmative beginning with a vowel, where it would otherwise stand in an open syllable (as קָטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ; but in *pause* קָטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ). Before an affirmative beginning with a consonant the *Pathah* remains, whether in the tone-syllable (קָטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ; in *pause* קָטְלוּ &c.) or *before* it. In the latter case, however, the *Qames* of the first syllable, being no longer a pretonic vowel, becomes vocal *Šewā*; as קָטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ; cf. § 27 *i* and § 43 *b*. On the retention of *ā* with *Meheg* of the counter-tone in the *Perf. consecutive*, cf. § 49 *i*.

c Rem. 1. Verbs *middle ē* in Hebrew (as in Ethiopic, but not in Arabic or Aramaic) generally change the *E*-sound in their inflexion into *Pathah* (frequently so even in the 3rd sing. masc. *Perf.*). This tendency to assimilate to the more common verbs *middle a* may also be explained from the laws of vocalization of the tone-bearing closed penultima, which does not readily admit of *Sere*, and never of *Hireq*, of which the *Sere* is a lengthening (cf. § 26 *p*). On the other hand, *Sere* is retained in an open syllable; regularly so in the weak stems לֹא (§ 74 *g*), before suffixes (§ 59 *i*), and in the pausal forms of the strong stem in an open tone-syllable, e.g. דִּבְרָהּ *it cleaveth*, Jb 29¹⁰ (not דִּבְרָהּ, cf. 2 S 1²³, Jb 41¹⁵; even (contrary to § 29 *g*) in a closed pausal syllable, e.g. שָׁבָן, Dt 33¹² (out of *pause* שָׁבָן, Is 32¹⁶); but קָטְלוּ Is 33⁹, &c., according to § 29 *g*).

d 2. In some weak stems *middle a*, the *Pathah* under the second radical sometimes, in a closed toneless syllable, becomes —, and, in one example, —. Thus from יִרְשָׁתָּהּ *and thou shalt possess it*, Dt 17¹⁴; וִירְשָׁתָּם Dt 19¹; וִירְשָׁתָּם Dt 4¹, and frequently; from יָלַד *to bring forth, to beget*; וְיִלְדֶּיךָ ψ 27 (cf. Nu 11¹², Jer 2²⁷, 15¹⁰); from בָּוֶשׂתָּם; וּבִשְׁתָּם Mal 3²⁰; from שָׁאַל; שְׁאַלְתִּי; I have asked him, 1 S 1²⁰ (Ju 13⁶), and three times שְׁאַלְתָּם 1 S 12¹³, 25⁵, Jb 21²⁹. Qimhi already suggests the explanation, that the *i* (ē) of these forms of שָׁאַל and יִרְשָׁ is the original vowel, since along with שָׁאַל and יִרְשָׁ are also found שְׁאַל and יִרְשָׁ (see the Lexicon). The possibility of this explanation cannot be denied (especially in the case of יִרְשָׁ, see § 69 *s*); the *i* in these forms might, however, equally well have arisen from an attenuation of *ā* (§ 27 *s*), such as must in any case be assumed in the other instances. Moreover, it is worthy of notice that in all the above cases the *i* is favoured by the character of the following consonant (a sibilant or dental), and in most of them also by the tendency towards assimilation of the vowels (cf. § 54 *k* and § 64 *f*).

e 3. In verbs *middle ō*, the *Holem* is retained in the tone-syllable, e.g. יִנָּתְּתָּ *thou didst tremble*; יָבִלּוּ in *pause* for יָבִלּוּ *they were able*; but in a toneless closed syllable the original short vowel appears in the form of a *Qames hatuph*; יִבְלִיתִי I have prevailed against him, ψ 13⁵; וְיִבְלִיתָ (see § 49 *h*) then shalt thou be able, Ex 18²³; in a toneless open syllable it becomes vocal *Šewā*, e.g. יִבְלִי.

f 4. Rarer forms¹ are: *Sing. 3rd fem.* in תָּ— (as in Arabic, Ethiopic, and

¹ Many of these forms, which are uncommon in Hebrew, are usual in the

Aramaic), e.g. אִלָּת *it is gone*, Dt 32³⁶; וְנִשְׁכַּחַת Is 23¹⁵ (in the Aramaic form, וְנִשְׁכַּחַת); from a verb עָרַבְתָּ , cf. § 72 o. This original feminine ending *-āth* is regularly retained before suffixes, see § 59 a; and similarly in stems לָה , either in the form *āth* (which is frequent also in stems לָה § 74 g), or with the *Pathah* weakened to vocal *Šewā* before the pleonastic ending הָ , e.g. נִלְתָּה § 75 i. In Ez 31⁵ the Aramaic form נִבְרָהָ occurs instead of נִבְרָהָ .

2nd masc. תָּה for תָּ (differing only orthographically), e.g. בְּנִדְתָּהּ *thou hast dealt treacherously*, Mal 2¹⁴; cf. 1 S 15³, Gn 3¹² (נִתְּתָהּ which is twice as common as נִתְּתָהּ , cf. § 66 h); Gn 21²³, 2 S 2²⁶, 2 K 9³, Is 2⁶, ψ 56⁹ (so also in *Hiph'el*; 2 K 9⁷, Is 37²³, ψ 60⁴).

2nd fem. has sometimes a Yodh at the end, as in הִלַּכְתִּי *thou wentest*, Jer 31²¹; הָ cf. 2³³, 3^{4,5}, 4¹⁹ (but read the ptc. שָׁמַעַת , with the LXX, instead of the 2nd fem.), 46¹¹, and so commonly in Jeremiah, and Ez (16¹⁸, &c.); see also Mi 4¹³, Ru 3^{3,4}. הִלַּכְתִּי , &c., is really intended, for the vowel signs in the text belong to the marginal reading הִלַּכְתָּ (without *ī*)¹ as in the corresponding pronoun אַתָּה (אַתָּה) § 32 h. The ordinary form has rejected the final *i*, but it regularly reappears when pronominal suffixes are added (§ 59 a, c).

1st pers. comm. sometimes without Yodh, as יָרַעַת ψ 140¹³, Jb 42², 1 K 8⁴⁸, ז Ez 16⁵⁹ (all in K^{ethibh}), ψ 16², without a Q^{erē}; in 2 K 18²⁰ also אִמְרַת is really intended, as appears from Is 36⁵. The Q^{erē} requires the ordinary form, to which the vowels of the text properly belong, whilst the K^{ethibh} is probably to be regarded as the remains of an earlier orthography, which omitted vowel-letters even at the end of the word.

תָּה as the termination of the 2nd plur. m. for תָּם Ez 33²⁶, might just possibly הָ be due to the following ת (cf., for an analogous case, Mi 3¹², § 87 e), but is probably a copyist's error. Plur. 2nd fem. in תִּלְנָה —(according to others תִּלְנָה)—Am 4³, but the reading is very doubtful; since הָ follows, it is perhaps merely due to dittography; cf., however, אִתְּנָה § 32 i.

3rd plur. comm. has three times the very strange termination וִן ; יָרַעַו Dt 38¹⁶ (both before אָ , and hence, no doubt, if the text is correct, to avoid a hiatus), and in the still more doubtful form צָקוֹן Is 26¹⁶; on וִן in the Imperf. see § 47 m; on the affixed וִן in Jos 10²⁴, Is 28¹², see § 23 i.

It is very doubtful whether, as in most Semitic languages (see § 47 c, note), וִן the 3rd fem. plur. in Hebrew was originally distinguished from the 3rd masc.

other Semitic dialects, and may, therefore, be called Aramaisms (Syriasms) or Arabisms. They must not, however, be regarded as cases of borrowing, but as a return to original forms.

¹ Where the Masora apparently regards the תָּה as the termination of the 2nd sing. fem., e.g. in Jer 2²⁰ (twice), Mi 4¹³, it has rather taken the form as 1st pers. sing. (cf. Stade, *Gramm.*, p. 253); so in Ju 5⁷, where קָמַתִּי , on account of verse 12, must either have originally been intended as 2nd sing. fem., or is due to an erroneous pronunciation of the form קָמַת as קָמַתִּי instead of 3rd sing. fem. קָמַת (as LXX).

² That these examples can hardly be referred to a primitive Semitic ending *ūn* in the 3rd plur. Perf., has been shown by Nöldeke in *ZDMG.* vol. 38, p. 409 ff.; cf. also *ZDMG.* vol. 32, p. 757 f., where G. Hoffmann proves that the terminations in *Nūn* of the 3rd plur. in Aramaic, formerly adduced by us, are secondary forms. [See also Driver, *Heb. Tenses*³, p. 6 note.]

plur. by the termination הַ , as in Biblical Aramaic. Nöldeke (*ZDMG.* 38 [1884], p. 411) referred doubtfully to the textual readings in Dt 21⁷, Jos 15⁴, 18^{12, 14, 19}, Jer 21⁵, 22⁸, where the Masora uniformly inserts the termination הַ , and to Gn 48¹⁰ in the Samaritan Pentateuch, Gn 49²², 1 S 4¹⁵, ψ 18³⁵, Neh 13¹⁰. In his *Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 19, however, he observes that the construction of a fem. plural with the 3rd sing. fem. is not unexampled, and also that הַ is often found as a mistake for ל . On the other hand Mayer Lambert (*Une série de Qeré ketib*, Paris, 1891, p. 6 ff.) explains all these K^ethibh, as well as ψ 73², Jer 50⁶ (?), and (against Nöldeke) 1 K 22⁴⁹ (where הַ is undoubtedly the article belonging to the next word), Jb 16¹⁶ (where the *masc.* פָּנִי requires the marginal reading), also Jer 48⁴¹, 51⁵⁶, Ez 26², ψ 68¹⁴, as remains of the 3rd fem. plur. in הַ . The form was abandoned as being indistinguishable from the (later) form of the 3rd fem. sing., but tended to be retained in the perfect of verbs לִהְיוֹת , as הָיָה K^ethibh six times in the above examples.

n 5. The affirmatives הַ , (הָ), הִי , נִי are generally toneless, and the forms with these inflexions are consequently *Mil'el* (מִלְּאֵל , &c.); with all the other affirmatives they are *Milra'* (§ 15 c). The place of the tone may, however, be shifted: (a) by the *pause* (§ 29 i-v), whenever a vowel which has become vocal Šewā under the second stem-consonant is restored by the *pause*; as קָטְלָה for קָטְלָה (דָּבַקָה for דָּבַקָה), and קָטְלוּ for קָטְלוּ (מָלְאוּ for מָלְאוּ); (b) in certain cases after *wāw* consecutive of the Perfect (see § 49 h).

O 6. Contraction of a final ת with the ת of the affirmative occurs e.g. in פָּרְתִי Hag 2⁵, &c.; cf. Is 14²⁰, &c., in the Perf. Po'el; Dt 4²⁵ in the Hiph'il of שָׁחַת ; Is 21², &c., in the Hiph'il of שָׁחַת . Contraction of a final נ with the affirmative נִי occurs in נָתַנִּי Gn 34¹⁶; in Niph. Ezr 9⁷, cf. 2 Ch 14¹⁰; in Hiph. 2 Ch 29¹⁹; with the affirmative נָה in the Imperfect Qal Ez 17²³; Pi'el ψ 71²³, where with Baer and Ginsburg הִרְפִּנָּה is to be read, according to others הִרְפִּנָּה (cf. in Po'el הִקְוִנָּה Ez 32¹⁶), but certainly not הִרְפִּנָּה with the Mantua ed., Opius and Hahn; with נָה in the Imperat. Hiph. Gn 4²³, Is 32⁹.

§ 45. The Infinitive.

F. Prätorius, 'Ueber den sog. Inf. absol. des Hebr.,' in *ZDMG.* 1902, p. 546 ff.

a 1. The Infinitive is represented in Hebrew by two forms, a shorter and a longer; both are, however, strictly speaking, independent nouns (*verbal substantives*). The shorter form, the *Infinitive construct* (in Qal קָטַל ,¹ sometimes incorrectly קָטֹל), is used in very various ways, sometimes in connexion with pronominal suffixes, or governing a substantive in the genitive, or with an accusative of the object (§ 115), sometimes in connexion with prepositions (לְקָטַל to kill, § 114 f), and sometimes in dependence upon substantives as genitive, or upon verbs as accusative of the object. On the other hand, the use of the longer form, the *Infinitive absolute* (in Qal קָטֹל , sometimes also קָטַל , obscured from original *qātāl*), is restricted to those cases in which it emphasizes

¹ Cf. the analogous forms of the noun, § 93 t.

the abstract verbal idea, without regard to the subject or object of the action. It stands most frequently as an adverbial accusative with a finite verb of the same stem (§ 113 h-s).¹

The flexibility and versatility of the Infin. constr. and the rigidity *b* and inflexibility of the Infin. absol. are reflected in their vocalization. The latter has unchangeable vowels, while the *ō* of the Infin. constr. may be lost. For קָטַל, according to § 84^a, *e*, goes back to the ground-form *qāṭāl*.

Other forms of the Infin. constr. Qal of the strong verb are—

(a) קָטַל, e. g. שָׁכַב to lie, Gn 34⁷; שָׁפַל to sink, Ec 12⁴; especially with verbs which have *ā* in the second syllable of the Imperf.: hence sometimes also with those, whose second or third radical is a guttural (frequently besides the ordinary form). All the examples (except שָׁכַב, see above) occur in the closest connexion with the following word, or with suffixes (see § 61 c). In Ez 21³³ the Masora seems to treat לָטַבַּח (verse 20, in pause לָטַבַּח) as an Infinitive=לָטַבַּח; probably לָטַבַּח should be read.

(b) קָטְלָה and, attenuated from it, קָטְלָה; קָטְלָה and קָטְלָה (which are *d* feminine forms² of קָטַל and קָטַל, mostly from intransitive verbs, and sometimes found along with forms having no feminine ending in use), e. g. לִאֲשָׁמָה to be guilty, Lv 5²⁶, אֶהְבֵּה to love, שִׁנְאָה to hate; לִירָאָה, often in Dt., to fear; וְזָקְנָה to be old; קָרָאָה to meet (in לְקָרְאָה § 19 k); לָרַבְעָה to lie down, Lv 20¹⁶; לְמַשְׁחָה to anoint, Ex 29²⁹; לָרַחֲצָה to wash, Ex 30¹⁸, &c.; לְטִמְאָה (also a subst. = uncleanness, like טִמְאָה) to be unclean, Lv 15³²; לְקָרְבָה to approach, Ex 36², &c.; cf. Lv 12⁴⁻⁵, Dt 11²², Is 30¹⁹, Ez 21¹⁶, Hag 1⁶; also רַחֲקָה to be far off, Ez 8⁶; חֲמָלָה to pity, Ez 16⁵; cf. Ho 7⁴. On the other hand in חֲמָלָה Gn 19¹⁶, the original *ā* has been modified to *ē*; cf. חֲזָקָה Is 8¹¹, &c.

(c) In the Aramaic manner (מִקְטַל but cf. also Arab. *magtal*) there occur as *e* Infin. Qal: מִשְׁלֹחַ to send, Est 9¹⁹; מִקְרָא to call and מִפָּעַע to depart, Nu 10² (Dt 10¹¹); מִקָּח to take, 2 Ch 19⁷, &c.; מִשָּׂא to carry, Nu 4²⁴, &c. (cf. even מִמְשָׁאוֹת Ez 17⁹); also with a feminine ending מִעֲלָה to go up, Ezr 7⁹, &c.; cf. for these forms (almost all very late) Ryssel, *De Elohistae Pentateuchici sermone*, p. 50, and Strack on Nu 4²⁴.

(d) קָטְלָת in יִבְשֶׁת Gn 8⁷; יִבְלָת Nu 14¹⁶; probably also חֲרִשֶׁת Ex 31⁵, 35³³.

2. A kind of *Gerund* is formed by the Infin. constr. with the prepo- *f* sition לְ; as לְקָטַל *ad interficiendum*, לְנָפַל *ad cadendum* (see § 28 a).

¹ The terms *absolute* and *construct* are of course not to be understood as implying that the Infin. constr. קָטַל forms the *construct state* (see § 89) of the Infin. absol. (קָטוּל ground-form *qāṭāl*). In the Paradigms the *Inf. constr.*, as the principal form, is placed before the other, under the name of Infinitive simply.

² According to the remark of Elias Levita on Qimhi's *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenb., 14 a, these feminine forms occur almost exclusively in connexion with the preposition לְ.

g The blending of the ל with the *Infin. constr.* into a single grammatical form seems to be indicated by the firmly closed syllable, cf. לִשְׁבֹּב Gn 34⁷; לִנְפֹל ψ 118¹³, with *Dageš lene* in the פ = *lin-pōl*; hence, also לִיָּתוֹל, &c.; but בִּנְפֹל *bin^ephōl*, Jb 4¹³; בִּנְפֹל 2 S 3³⁴. Exceptions לִצְבֹּא Nu 4²³, 8²⁴; לִנְתוֹשׁ וְלִנְתוֹץ Jer 1¹⁰, 18⁷, 31²³; לִשְׁדוֹר Jer 47⁴; לִטְבוֹחַ Jer 11¹⁹, &c., ψ 37¹⁴; לִבְרוֹק 2 Ch 34¹⁰; according to some also לִסְבֹּב Nu 21⁴ and לִכְבֹּשׁ 2 Ch 28¹⁰ (Baer לִכְבֹּשׁ); on the other hand בִּשְׁפֹן Gn 35²²; בִּזְכֹּר Jer 17². For the meaningless לִדְרִיּוֹשׁ Ezr 10¹⁶ read לִדְרֹשׁ.

§ 46. The Imperative.

a 1. The ground-forms of the Imperative, קָטַל (properly *qēṭūl*, which is for an original *qūṭūl*), and קָטַל (see below, c), the same in pronunciation as the forms of the *Infin. constr.* (§ 45), are also the basis for the formation of the Imperfect (§ 47).¹ They represent the *second* person, and have both fem. and plur. forms. The third person is supplied by the Imperfect in the Jussive (§ 109 b); and even the second person must always be expressed by the Jussive, if it be used with a negative, e. g. אַל-תִּקְטַל *ne occidas* (not אַל-קָטַל). The passives have no Imperative, but it occurs in the reflexives, as Niph'al and Hithpa'el.²

b 2. The Affirmatives of the 2nd sing. fem. and the 2nd plur. masc. and fem. are identical in every case with those of the Imperfect (§ 47 c). In the same way, the Imperative of the 2nd sing. masc., in common with the Imperfect, admits of the lengthening by the הַ-_τ *paragogicum* (§ 48 i), as, on the other hand, there are certain shortened forms of this person analogous to the Jussive (§ 48. 5).

c Rem. 1. Instead of the form קָטַל (sometimes also *plene*, e. g. שָׁמֹר Ec 12¹³; before *Maqqeph* קָטַל- with *Qameš ḥaṭuph*), those verbs which have an *a* in the final syllable of the *Imperf.* (i. e. especially verbs middle *ē*) make their Imperative of the form קָטַל, e. g. לְבַשׁ *dress!* (Perf. לָבַשׁ and לִבַּשׁ); שָׁכַב *lie down!* in pause שָׁכַב 1 S 3^{5.6.9}.

d 2. The first syllable of the sing. fem. and plur. masc. are usually to be pronounced with *Ṣewā mobile* (qūṭūl, qūṭūl, and so שִׁפְכִי, &c., without *Dageš lene*, and even מִשְׁכִּי with *Metheg*, Ex 12²¹; but cf. אֶסְפִּי Jer 10¹⁷, and with the same phonetic combination חִשְׁפִּי Is 47²; see analogous cases in § 93 m); less frequently we find an *ō* instead of the *i*, e. g. מִלְכִי *rule*, Ju 9¹⁰; מִשְׁכִּי *draw*, Ez 32²⁰; חִרְבִי Jer 2¹² (cf. חִרְבִי Is 44²⁷); on קָסְמִי 1 S 28⁸ *qerē*, צִטְקִי Jer. 22²⁰ (cf. 1 K 13⁷), see § 10 g. This *ō* arises (see above, a) from a singular ground-form *qūṭūl*, not from a retraction of the original *ū* of the second syllable. We must abandon the view that the forms with *i* in the first syllable (cf. also

¹ The *Infin. absol.*, like the Greek *Infin.*, is also sometimes used for the Imperative (§ 113 bb). Cf. in general, Koch, *Der semitische Inf.* (Schaffhausen, 1874).

² In *Hoph'al* an Imperative is found only twice (Ez 32¹⁹, Jer. 49⁸), and closely approximating in meaning to the reflexive.

אִמְרִי, חֲנִי, מְכִרִי, עֲבָרִי) arise from a weakening of the characteristic vowel *ä*. They, or at least some of them, must rather be regarded with Barth (*ZDMG.* 1889, p. 182) as analogous to the original *ä*-imperfects. See further analogies in §§ 47 *i* and 48 *i*; 61 b, 63 n.

The *pausal* form of the 2nd plur. masc. is יִנְרִי 1 K 3²⁰; from שָׁמְעוּ, שָׁמְעוּ, *e* &c.; similarly the 2nd sing. fem. in *pause* is עֲבָרִי Is 23¹²; even without the *pause* מְלֹכִי Ju 9^{10,12}, *Keth.*; קְדוֹמִי 1 S 28⁸, *Keth.* (cf. with this also מְלֹכֶה &c., § 48 *i*); from שָׁמַח, שָׁמְחִי Jo 2²¹.

3. In the 2nd plur. fem. שָׁמְעֶנָּה occurs once, in Gn 4²³ (for שָׁמְעֶנָּה) with loss of the הָ and insertion of a helping vowel, unless it is simply to be pointed שָׁמְעֶנָּה. Also instead of the abnormal קְרָאָן Ex 2²⁰ (for קְרָאָה) we should perhaps read as in Ru 1²⁰ קְרָאָה (cf. מִצָּאָה 1⁹ and לָבָן 1¹²).

On the examples of a 2nd plur. fem. in יִנְרִי, Is 32¹¹, see § 48 *i*.

§ 47. The Imperfect and its Inflexion.

1. The persons of the Imperfect,¹ in contradistinction to those of *α* the Perfect, are formed by placing abbreviated forms of the personal pronoun (preformatives) *before* the stem, or rather before the abstract form of the stem (קָטַל). As, however, the tone is retained on the characteristic vowel of the Stem-form, or even (as in the 2nd sing. fem. and the 3rd and 2nd plur. masc.) passes over to the affirmatives, the preformatives of the Imperfect appear in a much more abbreviated form than the affirmatives of the Perfect, only *one* consonant (י, ת, א, נ) remaining in each form. But as this preformative combined with the

¹ On the use of the Semitic Perfect and Imperfect cf. § 106 ff. and the literature cited in § 106. For our present purpose the following account will suffice:—The name *Imperfect* is here used in direct contrast to the Perfect, and is to be taken in a wider sense than in Latin and Greek grammar. The Hebrew (Semitic) *Perf.* denotes in general that which is *concluded*, *completed*, and *past*, that which has happened and has come into effect; but at the same time, also that which is *represented* as accomplished, even though it be continued into present time or even be actually still future. The *Imperf.* denotes, on the other hand, the *beginning*, the *unfinished*, and the *continuing*, that which is just happening, which is conceived as in process of coming to pass, and hence, also, that which is yet future; likewise also that which occurs repeatedly or in a continuous sequence in the past (Latin *Imperf.*). It follows from the above that the once common designation of the *Imperf.* as a *Future* emphasizes only *one* side of its meaning. In fact, the use of Indo-Germanic tense-names for the Semitic tenses, which was adopted by the Syrians under the influence of the Greek grammarians, and after their example by the Arabs, and finally by Jewish scholars, has involved many misconceptions. The Indo-Germanic scheme of three periods of time (past, present, and future) is entirely foreign to the Semitic tense-idea, which regards an occurrence only from the point of view of completed or incomplete action.—In the formation of the two tenses the chief distinction is that in the Perfect the verbal stem precedes and the indication of the person is added afterwards for precision, while in the *Imperf.* the subject, from which the action proceeds or about which a condition is predicated, is expressed by a prefixed pronoun.

stem-form was not always sufficient to express at the same time differences both of gender and number, the distinction had to be further indicated, in several cases, by special *affirmatives*. Cf. the table, § 40 c.

b 2. The derivation and meaning, both of the preformatives and the affirmatives, can still, in most cases, be recognized.

In the *first* pers. אָקטל, plur. נִקְטל, א is probably connected with אָנִי, and נ with נָהִי; here no indication of gender or number by a special ending was necessary. As regards the vocalization, the Arabic points to the ground-forms 'āqtūl and nāqtūl: the *i* of the 1st plur. is, therefore, as in the other preformatives, attenuated from *a*. The *Seghôl* of the 1st sing. is probably to be explained by the preference of the א for this sound (cf. § 22 o, but also § 51 p); according to Qimḥi, it arises from an endeavour to avoid the similarity of sound between אָקטל (which is the Babylonian punctuation) and יָקטל, which, according to this view, was likewise pronounced *iqtol*.¹

c The preformative ת of the *second* persons (תָּקטל, ground-form tāqtūl, &c.) is, without doubt, connected with the ת of אָתָּה, אַתָּה, &c., and the affirmative ׀ of the 2nd fem. sing. תִּקְטְלִי with the *i* of the original feminine form אָתִי (see § 32 h). The affirmative י of the 2nd masc. plur. תִּקְטְלוּ (in its more complete form, יָ, see m) is the sign of the plural, as in the 3rd pers., and also in the Perfect (§ 44 a). In the Imperfect, however, it is restricted in both persons to the masculine,² while the affirmative נָה (also ׀) of the 3rd and 2nd plur. fem. is probably connected with הָנָה *eae* and אֶתְנָה *vos* (fem.).

d The preformatives of the *third* persons (י in the masc. יָקטל, ground-form yāqtūl, plur. יִקְטְלוּ, ground-form yāqtūlū; ת in the fem. תִּקְטְל, plur. תִּקְטְלֶנָּה) have not yet met with any satisfactory explanation. With ת might most obviously be compared the original feminine

¹ Cf. § 24 e. In favour of the above view of Qimḥi may be urged the phonetic orthography אָשׁ (in Pr 18²⁴ אִישׁ), 2 S 14¹⁹ (unless, with Perles, אִשָּׁב is to be read), Mi 6¹⁰, for יֵשׁ, and אִישִׁי 1 Ch 2¹³ for יֵשִׁי (as verse 12). Also הָאִשָּׁה Mi 6¹¹ is probably for הָאִשָּׁה = הָאִשָּׁה, Is 10¹² for יִפְקֹד; אִנְחֹמֶד Is 51¹⁹ for יִנְחֹמֶד; and conversely יִשְׁכַּר is for אִשֵּׁשׁ = אִשֵּׁשׁ. Similarly, יִשְׁוִי 1 S 14⁴⁹ is probably for אִשְׁוִי or אִשְׁוִי; in 2 S 23⁸ יִשָּׁב בְּשֶׁבֶת is, according to the LXX, an error for יִשְׁבֶּשֶׁת = אִשְׁבֶּשֶׁת. In Assyrian also the simple *i* corresponds to the Hebrew *y* as the preformative of the Impf. Qal.

² This is also the proper gender of the plural syllable *ū*, *ūm*. In Hebrew, indeed, it is used in the 3rd plur. *Perfect* for both genders, but in the kindred languages even there only for the masculine, e.g. in Syriac *q'atūlū*, *q'atūlūn*, with the feminine form *q'atūlēn*, in Western Aram. *q'atūlū*, fem. *q'atūlā*; in Arab. *qātālū*, fem. *qātālūnā*, Eth. *qātālū*, *qātālā*.

ending η — of nouns, and of the 3rd fem. sing. perfect. For the affirmatives ו (וּ) and נָה, see c.

3. The characteristic vowel of the second syllable becomes $\check{S}^{ewa} e$ before tone-bearing affirmatives which begin with a vowel, but is retained (as being in the tone-syllable) before the toneless affirmative נָה. Thus: תִּקְטָלִי, תִּקְטָלִי, תִּקְטָלִי (but in *pause* תִּקְטָלִי, &c.), תִּקְטָלִי נָה.

Rem. 1. The \bar{o} of the second syllable (as in the inf. constr. and imperat.), being lengthened from an original \bar{u} in the tone-syllable, is only tone-long (§ 9 r). Hence it follows that: (a) it is incorrectly, although somewhat frequently, written *plene*; (b) before *Maqqeph* the short vowel appears as *Qames ḥaṭuph*, e.g. וִיכָתֵב-שָׁם and he wrote there, Jos 8³² (but cf. also Ex 21³⁷, Jos 18²⁰); (c) it becomes \check{S}^{wa} before the tone-bearing affirmatives ו— and ו (see above, e; but Jerome still heard e.g. *iezbuleni* for וִיבָלִי; cf. ZAW. iv. 83).

Quite anomalous are the three examples which, instead of a shortening to \check{S}^{wa} , exhibit a long \bar{u} : הֵם יִשְׁפּוּטוּ Ex 18^{2a}, immediately before the principal pause, but according to Qimḥi (ed. Rittenb. p. 18^b), ed. Mant., Ginsb., Kittel against the other editions, with the tone on the ultima; likewise לֹא-תַעֲבֹרִי מִיָּה Ru 2⁸; תִּשְׁמְרוּם (in principal pause) Pr 14³. In the first two cases perhaps יִשְׁפּוּטוּ and תַּעֲבֹרִי (for יִשְׁפּוּטוּ, &c.) are intended, in virtue of a retrogressive effect of the pause; in Pr 14³ תִּשְׁמְרוּם is to be read, with August Müller.

2. The \bar{o} of the second syllable is to be found almost exclusively with transitive verbs middle a , like קָטַל. Intransitives middle a and \bar{e} almost always take \check{a} (*Pathaḥ*)¹ in the impf., e.g. יָרַבֵּן, יָרַבֵּן to couch, שָׁכַב, יִשְׁכַּב to lie down (לָמַד, יִלְמַד to learn is also originally intransitive = to accustom oneself); יִגְדַּל, יִגְדַּל to become great (but cf. שָׁכַן and שָׁכַן imperf. יִשְׁכֹּן to dwell and to inhabit, נָבַל imperf. יִבַּל to wither); also from verbs middle \bar{o} , as קָטַן to be small, the imperf. has the form יִקְטַן.

Sometimes both forms occur together; those with \bar{o} having a transitive, \check{a} and those with \check{a} an intransitive meaning, e.g. יִקְצַר he cuts off, יִקְצַר he is cut off, i. e. is short; חָלַשׁ impf. \bar{o} , to overcome, Ex 17¹³; impf. \check{a} , to be overcome, Jb 14¹⁰. More rarely both forms are used without any distinction, e.g. יִשֶּׁף and יִשֶּׁף he bites, יִיחַץ and יִיחַץ he is inclined (but only the latter with a transitive meaning = he bends, in Jb 40¹⁷). On the a of the impf. of verbs middle and third guttural, cf. § 64 b; § 65 b. In some verbs first guttural (§ 63 n), ע"ע (§ 67 p), פ"י (§ 69 b), and פ"א (§ 68 c), and in יָתַן for yintēn from נָתַן to give, instead of \check{a} or \bar{o} a movable *Sere* (originally \check{e}) is found in the second syllable. A trace of these \check{e} -imperfects² in the ordinary strong verb is probably to be found in וִיטַבְּנוּ 2 K 7⁸, since טַב otherwise only occurs in Qal. We call these three forms of the imperfect after their characteristic vowel impf. \bar{o} , impf. a , impf. e .

3. For the 3rd sing. fem. תִּקְטָל (= *tiq-ṭāl*), Baer requires in 1 S 25²⁰ תִּקְטָלִי (but read with ed. Mant., &c. תִּקְטָלִי). For the 2nd sing. fem. (תִּקְטָלִי) the form

¹ This \check{a} is, however, by no means restricted to intransitive strong verbs; apart from verbs third guttural (§ 65 b), it is to be found in פ"ן and ע"ע, and in many verbs פ"א and פ"י (§§ 69-71).

² Cf. Barth, 'Das \check{e} -Imperfekt im Nordsemitischen,' ZDMG. 1889, p. 177 ff.

תִּקְטֹל is found in Is 57⁸, Jer 3⁵, Ez 22⁴, 23³², in every case after the regular form; but cf. also Ez 26¹⁴. In Is 17¹⁰, where the 2nd fem. precedes and follows, probably תִּקְרַעְנָי is to be read with Marti for תִּקְרַעְנִי.—For the 3rd plur. fem. תִּקְטֹלְנָה we find in Jer 49¹¹, in pause תִּבְטְחוּ (for תִּבְטְחֶנָּה), and thrice (as if to distinguish it from the 2nd pers.) the form יִקְטֹלְנָה with the preformative י (as always in Western Aram., Arab., Eth., and Assyr.), in Gn 30³⁸, 1 S 6¹², Dn 8²². On the other hand, תִּקְטֹלְנָה appears in some cases to be incorrectly used even for the fem. of the 3rd pers. or for the masc. of the 2nd pers. sing. as תִּשְׁלַחְנָה Ju 5²⁶ (where, however, perhaps תִּשְׁלַחְנָה is to be read), and Ob¹³, for 2nd sing. masc., according to Olshausen a corruption of יִשְׁלַח; in Pr 1²⁰, 8³ for תִּרְנֶה read תִּרְנָה as in Jb 39²³; in Ex 1¹⁰ read תִּקְרַאֲנָה with the Samaritan.—In Is 27¹¹, 28³, as also in Jb 17¹⁶ (if we read מִטְבְּחֵי with LXX for the 2nd תִּקְבְּחֵי), it is equally possible to explain the form as a plural. This small number of examples hardly justifies our finding in the above-mentioned passages the remains of an emphatic form of the Impf., analogous to the Arab. *Modus energicus I*, with the termination *annā*.

l For נָה we frequently find, especially in the Pentateuch and mostly after *wāw* consecutive, simply נָ, e.g. Gn 19^{33,36}, 37⁷, Ex 1^{18,19}, 15²⁰, Nu 2^{5,2}, Ez 3²⁰, 16⁵⁵; in Arab. always *nā*. According to Elias Levita תִּלְבִּשְׁנָה (2 S 13¹⁸) is the only example of this kind in the strong verb. The form וַתִּגְבְּהֶנָּה (so also Qimhi and ed. Mant.; but Baer, Ginsb. וַתִּגְבְּהֶנָּה) for וַתִּגְבְּהֶנָּה they were high, Ez 16⁵⁰, is irregular, with י inserted after the manner of verbs ע"ע and ע"י, § 67 d; § 72 i; according to Olshausen it is an error caused by the following form.

m 4. Instead of the plural forms in י there are, especially in the older books, over 300 forms¹ with the fuller ending ין (with *Nūn paragogicum*), always bearing the tone; cf. § 29 m and § 44 l; on its retention before suffixes, see § 60 e; also defectively יִרְבֹּן Ex 21¹⁸, 22⁸, &c. This usually expresses marked emphasis, and consequently occurs most commonly at the end of sentences (in the principal pause), in which case also the (pausal) vowel of the second syllable is generally retained. Thus there arise full-sounding forms such as יִלְקָטִין they collect, ψ 104²⁸; יִרְגָּזִין they tremble, Ex 15¹⁴; יִשְׁמָעְנָה ye shall hear, Dt 1¹⁷; cf. Ex 34¹³, with Zaqeph qāṭon, Athnaḥ, and Silluq; Jos 24¹⁵, with Segolta; Is 13⁸ and 17¹³ with Zaqeph qāṭon, 17¹² with Athnaḥ and Silluq, 41⁵ after *wāw* consec. Without the pause, e.g. יִדְרֹכֶנָּה קֶשֶׁת, cf. 4³, Gn 18^{28,29,30} ff., 44¹, Nu 32²³, Jos 4⁶ (יִשְׁאָלֶנָּה); Is 8¹², 1 S 9¹³, Ru 2⁹ (יִקְרְאוּ) and יִשְׁאָבֶנָּה); Ju 11¹⁸ after *wāw* consec.

Some of these examples may be partly due to euphonic reasons, e.g. certainly Ex 17², Nu 16²⁹, 32²⁰, 1 S 9¹³, 1 K 9⁶, and often, to avoid a hiatus before ׀ or ׀. It was, however, the pause especially which exerted an influence on the restoration of this older and fuller termination (cf. § 159 c, note), as is manifest from Is 26¹¹: בְּלִי-יִחוּזִין יִחוּזִי וַיִּבְשׂוּ they see not; may they see and become

¹ [See details in F. Böttcher, *Lehrb.*, § 930; and cf. Driver on 1 S 2¹⁵.]

ashamed. All this applies also to the corresponding forms in the Imperfect of the derived conjugations.¹ In Aramaic and Arabic this earlier נ (old Arabic *ūnā*) is the regular termination; but in some dialects of vulgar Arabic it has also become *ū*.

With an affixed נ we find (in the imperf. Niph'al) יִנְשׂוּן Jer 10⁵, evidently *n* an error for יִנְשׂוּן, caused by the preceding נִשְׂוֹן.—In יִשְׂוֹן Is 35¹, since נ follows, the נ is no doubt only due to dittography.

5. Corresponding to the use of נ for נ there occurs in the 2nd sing. fem., *o* although much less frequently, the fuller ending יִנְּ (as in Aram. and Arab.; old Arab. *inā*), also always with the tone, for יִנְּ, generally again in the principal pause, and almost in all cases with retention of the vowel of the penultima; thus הִתְּבָּקִין Ru 2^{8,21}, cf. 3^{4,18}, 1 S 11¹⁴ (הִתְּבָּקִין), Jer 31²², Is 45¹⁰.

6. On the reappearance in pause of the *ō* which had become *šwā* in the *p* forms הִתְּבָּקִין, &c., see above, *e*; similarly, the imperfects with *ā* restore this vowel in pause and at the same time lengthen it (as a tone-vowel) to *ā*, hence, e.g. הִתְּבָּקִין, יִנְּ. This influence of the pause extends even to the forms without affirmatives, e.g. הִתְּבָּקִין, in pause הִתְּבָּקִין. But the fuller forms in *ūn* and *in* have the tone always on the ultima, since the vowels *ū* and *i* in a closed final syllable never allow of the retraction of the tone.

7. On the numerous instances of passive forms in the imperfect, mostly *q* treated as Hoph'al, see § 53 *u*.

§ 48. Shortening and Lengthening of the Imperfect and Imperative. The Jussive and Cohortative.

1. Certain modifications which take place in the form of the *a* imperfect, and express invariably, or nearly so, a distinct shade of meaning, serve to some extent as a compensation for the want of special forms for the *Tempora relativa* and for certain *moods* of the verb.

2. Along with the usual form of the imperfect, there exists also *b* a lengthened form of it (the *cohortative*), and a shortened form (the *jussive*).² The former occurs (with few exceptions) only in the 1st person, while the latter is mostly found in the 2nd and 3rd persons, and less frequently in the 1st person. The laws of the tone, however, and of the formation of syllables in Hebrew, not infrequently precluded the indication of the jussive by an actual shortening of the form; consequently it often—and, in the imperfect forms with affirmatives, always—coincides with the ordinary imperfect (*indicative*) form.

In classical Arabic the difference is almost always evident. That language distinguishes, besides the indicative *yāqtūlū*, (*a*) a subjunctive, *yāqtūllā*; (*b*) a

¹ It is to be observed that the Chronicles often omit the *Nūn*, where it is found in the parallel passage in the Books of Kings; cf. 1 K 8^{38,43} with 2 Ch 6^{29,33}; 1 K 12²⁴, 2 K 11⁵ with 2 Ch 11⁴, 23⁴.

² The perfect has only *one* form, since it cannot be used, like the imperfect, to express mood-relations (see § 106 *p*).

jussive, *yāqtūl*; (c) a double 'energetic' mood of the impf., *yāqtūlānnā* and *yāqtūlān*, in pause *yāqtūlā*, the last form thus corresponding to the Hebrew cohortative.

- c 3. The characteristic of the cohortative form is an \bar{a} (הָ) affixed to the 1st pers. sing. or plur., e.g. אֶקְטֹל from קָטַל.¹ It occurs in almost all conjugations and classes of the strong and weak verb (except of course in the passives), and this final הָ has the tone wherever the affirmatives י and יְ would have it. As before these endings, so also before the הָ cohortative, the movable vowel of the last syllable of the verbal form becomes *Šewā*, e.g. in Qal אֶשְׁמְרָה *I will observe*, in Pi'el נִתְקַדְּהָ *let us break asunder*, ψ 2³; on אֶשְׁקָטָה Is 18⁴ *Qerê* (cf. also 27⁴, Ezr 8²⁵, &c.), see § 10 h; with the *Kethîbh* of these passages, compare the analogous cases יִשְׁפּוּטוּ, &c., § 47 g.—On the other hand, an unchangeable vowel in the final syllable is retained as tone-vowel before the הָ, as (e.g.) in Hiph. אֶפְיְרָה *I will praise*. In pause (as before *ā* and *i*), the vowel which became *Šewā* is restored as tone-vowel; thus for the cohortative אֶשְׁמְרָה the pausal form is אֶשְׁמְרָה ψ 59¹⁰; cf. Gn 18²¹, Is 41²⁶.

- d The change of הָ into the obtuse הָ seems to occur in 1 S 28¹⁵, unless, with Nestle, we are to assume a conflate reading, וְאֶקְרָא and וְאֶקְרָא; and with the 3rd pers. ψ 20⁴, in a syllable sharpened by a following *Dageš forte conjunct.*; cf. similar cases of the change of הָ into the obtuse הָ in *l* and in §§ 73 *ā*, 80 *i*, 90 *i*. In ψ 20⁴, however, יִרְשָׁנָה—with suffix—is probably intended. An הָ cohort. is also found with the 3rd pers. in Is 5¹⁹ (twice); Ez 23²⁰, and again in verse 16 according to the *Qerê*, but in both these cases without any effect on the meaning. Probably another instance occurs in Jb 11¹⁷, although there תַעֲצָה might also, with *Qimhî*, be regarded as 2nd masc. For the doubly irregular form תִּבְּרֹאתָ Dt 33¹⁶ (explained by Olshausen and König as a scribal error, due to a confusion with תבואת in verse 14), read תִּבְּרֹאנָה. For תִּבְּרֹאתָ Jb 22²¹ the noun תִּבְּרֹאתָ *thine increase*, might be meant, but the Masora has evidently intended an imperfect with the ending *ath*, instead of הָ, before the suffix, on the analogy of the 3rd sing. fem. perfect, see § 59 a; and ותבאת 1 S 25³⁴, see § 76 h.

- e The cohortative expresses the direction of the will to an action and thus denotes especially self-encouragement (in the 1st plur. an exhortation to others at the same time), a resolution or a wish, as an optative, &c., see § 108.

- f 4. The general characteristic of the jussive form of the imperfect is rapidity of pronunciation, combined with a tendency to retract

¹ Probably this \bar{a} goes back to the syllable *an*, which in Arabic (see above, Rem. to b) is used for the formation of the 'energetic' mood, and in Hebrew (see the footnote to § 58 i) often stands before suffixes.

the tone from the final syllable, in order by that means to express the urgency of the command in the very first syllable. This tendency has, in certain forms, even caused a material shortening of the termination of the word, so that the expression of the command appears to be concentrated on a single syllable. In other cases, however, the jussive is simply marked by a shortening of the vowel of the second syllable, without its losing the tone, and very frequently (see above, *b*) the nature of the form does not admit of any alteration. It is not impossible, however, that even in such cases the jussive in the living language was distinguished from the indicative by a change in the place of the tone.

In the strong verb the jussive differs in *form* from the indicative *g* only in *Hiph'il* (juss. יִקְטִיל, ind. יִקְטִיל), and similarly in the weak verb, wherever the imperfect indicative has *i* in the second syllable, e. g. from יִשָּׁב impf. *Hiph.* יוֹשִׁיב, juss. יוֹשִׁב; from יָמַת, יָמִית and יָמַת; also in *Qal* of the verbs עָזַי and עָזָי, as יָמַת, ind. יָמִית; יָגַל, ind. יָגִיל; in all conjugations of verbs לָה, so that the rejection (*apocope*) of the ending הָ in *Qal* and *Hiph.* gives rise to monosyllabic forms, with or without a helping vowel under the second radical, e. g. *Qal* ind. יָגִל, juss. יָגַל; *Hiph.* ind. יָגִלָּה, juss. יָגַלָּה; and in the *Pi'el* יָצָא from the indic. יִצְאָה (called apocopated imperfections). But almost all¹ the plural forms of the jussive coincide with those of the indicative, except that the jussive excludes the fuller ending הִן. Neither do the forms of the 2nd sing. fem., as תִּקְטִילִי, תִּמְוִיתִי, &c., admit of any change in the jussive, nor any forms, whether singular or plural, to which suffixes are attached, e. g. תִּמְוִיתִי as ind. Jer 38¹⁵, as jussive Jer 41⁸.

The meaning of the jussive is similar to that of the cohortative, *h* except that in the jussive the command or wish is limited almost exclusively to the 2nd or 3rd pers. On special uses of the jussive, e. g. in hypothetical sentences (even in the 1st pers.), see § 109 *h*.

5. The imperative, in accordance with its other points of connexion *i* with the imperfect in form and meaning, admits of a similar lengthening (by הָ, Arab. *imper. energicus*, with the ending -ānnā or -ān, in pause -ā) and shortening. Thus in *Qal* of the strong verb, the lengthened form of שָׁמַר *guard* is שָׁמְרָה² (*šomerā*, cf. קָטַל *qāṭel*, § 46 *d*); עֹבֵד, עֹבְדָה, Jer 49¹¹; שָׁכַב, שָׁכְבָה, *lie down*; שָׁמַע, שָׁמְעָה, *hear*, in lesser pause שָׁמְעָה

¹ Only in 1st plur. do we find a few shortened forms, as נִשְׁאָר 1 S 14³⁶, parallel with cohortatives; and נָרָא Is 41²⁸ *Keth.*

² On the reading שָׁמְרָה (i. e. *šām'rā*, according to the Jewish grammarians), required by the Masora in ψ 86², 119¹⁶⁷ (cf. also Is 38¹⁴, and שָׁמְרָנִי ψ 16¹), see § 9 *v*; on מְלוּכָה, Ju 9⁸ *Keth.*, see § 46 *e*.

Dn 9¹⁹; in Niph'al הִשְׁבָּעָה Gn 21²³. Cf., however, also מָכַר *sell*, Gn 25³¹, notwithstanding the impf. יָמַר ; עָרַב Jb 33⁵ (cf. עָרַב Jer 46³), but impf. יַעֲרֹף ; אָסַף *collect*, Nu 11¹⁶ (for 'אָס cf. § 63 *l* and the plural אָסְפוּ), but 2nd masc. אָסַף ; נָצַרָה ψ 141³. Barth (see above, § 47 *i* note) finds in these forms a trace of old imperfects in *i*, cf. § 63 *n*. On the other hand, קָרַבָה ψ 69¹⁹ (also Imperat. קָרַב Lv 9⁷, &c.), but impf. יִקְרַב. Without ה, we have the form לָךְ *go*, Nu 23¹³, Ju 19¹³, 2 Ch 25¹⁷. The form קָטַל in pause becomes קָטְלָה, the form קָטַל becomes קָטְלָה, e. g. יִרְשָׁה Dt 33²³. But also without the pause we find מָלְכָה Ju 9⁸ *Keth.* and צָרְפָה ψ 26² *Keth.*, on which see § 46 *e*. On the other hand רָנְזָה, פָּשְׁטָה, עָרָה, חֲנֻזָה Is 32¹¹ are to be explained as aramaizing forms of the 2nd plur. fem.; also for חָרְרִי v. 11 read חָרְרָה, and for סָפְרִים v. 12 read סָפְרָה.

k The shortened imperative is found only in verbs ל"ה, e. g. in *Piel* נָלַ from נָלָה. The shade of meaning conveyed by the imperatives with ה— is not always so perceptible as in the cohortative forms of the imperfect, but the longer form is frequently emphatic, e. g. קוּם *rise up*, קוּמָה *up!* הֵן *give*, הֵנָּה *give up!*

l Rem. The form דָּעָה for דָּעָה, best attested in Pr 24¹⁴ (where it is taken by the Masora as imperat., not as infin., דָּעָה) is evidently due to the influence of the ה which follows it in close connexion (so Strack, on the analogy of Jb 31²); for other examples of this change of *a* to *S^eghol*, see above, under *d*, § 73 *d*, and § 80 *i*. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether רָבָה Ju 9²⁹ (from רָבָה) is intended for רָבָה, and not rather for the common form of the imperative *Piel* רָבָה. In favour of the former explanation it may be urged that the imperative יִצָּא (from יָצָא) follows immediately after; in favour of the latter, that the ending ה—, with imperatives of verbs ל"ה, is not found elsewhere, and also that here no guttural follows (as in Pr 24¹⁴).

§ 49. The Perfect and Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive.

a 1. The use of the two tense-forms, as is shown more fully in the Syntax (§§ 106, 107, cf. above, § 47, note on *a*), is by no means restricted to the expression of the past or future. One of the most striking peculiarities in the Hebrew *consecution* of tenses¹ is the phenomenon that, in representing a series of past events, only the first

¹ The other Semitic languages do not exhibit this peculiarity, excepting the Phœnician, the most closely related to Hebrew, and of course the Moabitish dialect of the *Méša'* inscription, which is practically identical with Old Hebrew. It also appears in the inscription of חָמָת of Hamāth (cf. Nöldeke, ZA. 1908, p. 379) where we find וָאִשָּׂא יָדִי and *I lifted up my hand*, וַיַּעֲנֵנִי and *he answered me*, after a perfect of narration.

verb stands in the perfect, and the narration is continued in the imperfect. Conversely, the representation of a series of future events begins with the imperfect, and is continued in the perfect. Thus in 2 K 20¹, *In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death* (perf.), and *Isaiah . . . came* (imperf.) *to him, and said* (imperf.) *to him, &c.* On the other hand, Is 7¹⁷, *the Lord shall bring* (imperf.) *upon thee . . . days, &c., 7¹⁸, and it shall come to pass* (perf. הָיָה) *in that day . . .*

This progress in the sequence of time, is regularly indicated by *b* a pregnant *and* (called *wāw consecutive*¹), which in itself is really only a variety of the ordinary *wāw copulative*, but which sometimes (in the imperf.) appears with a different vocalization. Further, the tenses connected by *wāw consecutive* sometimes undergo a change in the tone and consequently are liable also to other variations.

2. The *wāw consecutive* of the *imperfect* is (*a*) pronounced with *c* *Pathah* and a *Dageš forte* in the next letter, as וַיִּקַּטַּל *and he killed*; before *נ* of the 1st pers. sing. (according to § 22 *c*) with *Qames*, as וַיִּקַּטַּלְנִי *and I killed*. Exceptions are, וַיִּבְרַחְנִי Ez 16¹⁰ according to the *Dikduke ha-ʿamim*, § 71; also וַיִּמְתְּתֵנִי 2 S 1¹⁰ according to *Qimḥi*; but in Ju 6⁹ וַיִּשְׁתְּנִי should be read according to *Baer*, and וַיִּשְׁתְּנִי in both places in Ju 20⁶. *Dageš forte* is always omitted in the preformative ו, in accordance with § 20 *m*.

(*b*) When a shortening of the imperfect form is possible (cf. § 48 *g*), *d* it takes effect, as a rule (but cf. § 51 *n*), after *wāw consec.*, e.g. in Hiphil וַיִּקַּטַּל (§ 53 *n*). The tendency to retract the tone from the final syllable is even stronger after *wāw consec.* than in the jussive. The throwing back of the tone on to the penultima (conditional upon its being an open syllable with a long vowel, § 29 *a*), further involves the greatest possible shortening of the vowel of the ultima, since the vowel then comes to stand in a toneless closed syllable, e.g. וַיִּקַּטַּל, juss.

¹ This name best expresses the prevailing syntactical relation, for by *wāw consecutive* an action is always represented as the direct, or at least temporal consequence of a preceding action. Moreover, it is clear from the above examples, that the *wāw consecutive* can only be thus used in immediate conjunction with the verb. As soon as *wāw*, owing to an insertion (e.g. a negative), is separated from the verb, the imperfect follows instead of the perfect *consecutive*, the perfect instead of the imperfect *consecutive*. The fact that whole Books (Lev., Num., Josh., Jud., Sam., 2 Kings, Ezek., Ruth, Esth., Neh., 2 Chron.) begin with the imperfect *consecutive*, and others (Exod., 1 Kings, Ezra) with *wāw copulative*, is taken as a sign of their close connexion with the historical Books now or originally preceding them. Cf., on the other hand, the independent beginning of Job and Daniel. It is a merely superficial description to call the *wāw consecutive* by the old-fashioned name *wāw conversive*, on the ground that it always converts the meaning of the respective tenses into its opposite, i.e. according to the old view, the future into the preterite, and vice versa.

וָקָם, with *wāw* consec. וָקָם and he arose (§ 67 n and x, § 68 d, § 69 p, § 71, § 72 t and aa, § 73 e).¹

e In the *first* pers. sing. alone the retraction of the tone and even the reducing of the long vowel in the final syllable (*ā* to *ō*, *ī* to *ē*, and then to *ö* and *ě*) are not usual,² at least according to the Masoretic punctuation, and the apocope in verbs וָקָם occurs more rarely; e.g. always וָקָם (or וָקָם, a merely orthographic difference) and I arose; *Hiph.* וָקָם (but generally written וָקָם, implying the pronunciation *wā'āqem*, as וָקָם implies *wā'āqōm*); וָרָא and I saw, more frequently than וָרָא, § 75 t. On the other hand, the form with final ה־ is often used in the 1st pers. both sing. and plur., especially in the later books, e.g. וָשַׁלַּח and I sent, Gn 32⁶, 41¹¹, 43²¹, Nu 8¹⁹ (וָשַׁלַּח, as in Ju 6⁹, 1 S 2²⁸, 2 S 12²⁸, and often, probably a sort of compensation for the lost נ); Ju 6¹⁰, 12³, 2 S 22²⁴, ψ 3⁶, 7⁵, 90¹⁰, 119⁵⁵, Jb 1¹⁵ x, 19²⁰, Ez 7²⁸, 8²⁵, 9³, Neh 2¹³, 5^{7,8,13}, 6¹¹, 13^{7-11,21} t, &c.—Sometimes, as in ψ 3⁶, with a certain emphasis of expression, and probably often, as in Ju 10¹², וָשַׁעַר before נ, for euphonic reasons. In Is 8² וָשַׁעַר may have been originally intended; in ψ 73¹⁶ וָשַׁח and in Jb 30²⁶ וָשַׁח. In Ez 3³ read וָשַׁח or וָשַׁח.

f This וָ is in meaning a strengthened *wāw* copulative, and resembles in pronunciation the form which is retained in Arabic as the ordinary copula (*wā*).³ The close connexion of this *wā* with the following consonant, caused the latter in Hebrew to take Dageš, especially as *ā* could not have been retained in an open syllable. Cf. בָּמָה, בָּמָה, לָמָה (for לָמָה), where the prepositions בָּ and לָ, and the particle בָּ, are closely connected with מָה in the same way (§ 102 k).

g The retraction of the tone also occurs in such combinations, as in לָמָה (for לָמָה § 102 l).—The identity of many consecutive forms with jussives of the same conjugation must not mislead us into supposing an intimate relation between the moods. In the consecutive forms the shortening of the vowel (and the retraction of the tone) seems rather to be occasioned solely by the strengthening of the preformative syllable, while in the jussives the shortening (and retraction) belongs to the character of the form.

h 3. The counterpart of *wāw* consecutive of the imperfect is *wāw* consecutive of the perfect, by means of which perfects are placed as

¹ The plural forms in נָ also occur less frequently after *wāw* consecutive; cf., however, וָרִיבִין Ju 8¹, 11¹⁸, Am 6³, Ez 44⁸, Dt 4¹¹, 5²⁰. The 2nd fem. sing. in וָ never occurs after *wāw* consecutive.

² In the 1st plur. וָנֶעֱמִיד Neh 4³ is the only instance in which the vowel remains unreduced (cf. וָנֶשֶׁב, i. e. וָנֶשֶׁב, 4⁹ *Keil*; *Qerē* וָנֶשֶׁב). On the treatment of the tone in the imperfect, imperative, and infinitive *Niph'al*, see § 51 n.

³ In usage the Hebrew *wāw* does duty for the Arabic *fā* (*wāw* apodosis, see § 143 d) as well as *wā*.

the sequels in the future to preceding actions or events regarded as incomplete at the time of speaking, and therefore in the imperfect, imperative, or even participle. This *wāw* is in form an ordinary *wāw copulative*, and therefore shares its various vocalization (ו, וי, וי, as 2 K 7⁴, and וי); e. g. וְהָיָה, after an imperfect, &c., and so it happens = and it will happen. It has, however, the effect, in certain verbal forms, of shifting the tone from the penultima, generally on to the ultima, e. g. הָלַכְתִּי *I went*, consecutive form וְהָלַכְתִּי *and I will go*, Ju 1³, where it is co-ordinated with another *perfect consecutive*, which again is the consecutive to an *imperative*. See further on this usage in § 112.

As the first of the above examples shows, the *Qames* of the first syllable is *i* retained in the strong perf. consec. Qal, as formerly before the tone, so now in the secondary tone, and therefore necessarily takes *Metheg*. On the other hand, the *ō* of the second syllable in verbs middle *ō* upon losing the tone necessarily becomes *ō*, e. g. וְיִכְלֹתָ Ex 18²³.

The shifting forward of the tone after the *wāw consecutive* of the *perfect* is, *l* however, not consistently carried out. It is omitted—(a) always in the 1st pers. pl., e. g. וְיִשְׁכְּנוּ Gn 34¹⁶; (b) regularly in Hiph'il before the affirmatives הִנֵּה and וְ, see § 53 r; and (c) in many cases in verbs אֲלֵ and הֲלֵ, almost always in the 1st sing. of אֲלֵ (Jer 29¹⁴), and in הֲלֵ if the vowel of the 2nd syllable is *i*, Ex 17⁶, 26^{4.6.7.10}, Ju 6²⁶, &c., except in Qal (only Lv 24⁵, before א) and the 2nd sing. masc. of Hiph'il-forms before א, Nu 20³, Dt 20¹³, 1 S 15³, 2 K 13¹⁷; similarly in Pi'el before א, Ex 25⁴, Jer 27⁴. On the other hand the tone is generally moved forward if the second syllable has *e* (in אֲלֵ Gn 27¹⁰ &c., in הֲלֵ Ex 40⁴, Jer 33⁶, Ez 32⁷); but cf. also וְיִרְאֶתָּה Lv 19^{14.32} and frequently, always before the counter-tone, Jo 4²¹, ψ 19^{14.1}. With *ā* in the penultima the form is וְנִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה Is 14⁴, and probably also וְקָרְאֶתָּה Jer 2², 3¹², 1 S 10² with little T'li^ā, a postpositive accent.

But before a following *l* the ultima mostly bears the tone on phonetic grounds, e. g. וְבָאֲתָּ אֵלַי Gn 6¹³, Ex 3¹⁸, Ze 6¹⁰ (by the side of וְבָאֲתָּ, &c. (cf., however, וְקָרְאֶתָּה, before א, Gn 17¹⁹, Jer 7²⁷, Ez 36²⁹); וְהִכִּיתָ אֶת־ Ju 6¹⁶, cf. Ex 25¹¹, Lv 24⁵ (but also וְנִשְׁחַתְּ אֶת־ Lv 25²¹). Likewise, before ה, Am 8⁹, and ע, e. g. Gn 26¹⁰, 27¹², Lv 26²⁵ (cf., however, וְקָרְאֶתָּה עָלָיו, Ez 38²¹); on verbs עֵע, see § 67 k and ee.

(d) The tone always keeps its place when such a perfect stands in *pause*, *m* e. g. וְשָׁבַעְתָּ Dt 6¹¹, 11¹⁵; וְאָמַרְתָּ Is 14⁴, Ju 4⁸; sometimes even in the lesser pause, as Dt 2²⁸, Ez 3²⁶, 1 S 29⁸ (where see Driver), with *Zaqeph qaton*; and frequently also immediately before a tone-syllable (according to § 29 e), as in וְיִשְׁבַּחְתָּהּ Dt 17¹⁴, Ez 14¹³, 17²², Am 1^{4.7.10.12}—but also וְיִשְׁקָתָּהּ Dt 21¹¹, 23¹⁴, 24¹⁹, 1 K 8⁴⁶.

¹ The irregularity in the tone of these perfects manifestly results from following conflicting theories, not that of Ben Ašer alone.

§ 50. The Participle.

- a** 1. Qal has both an active participle, called *Pō'ēl* from its form (פֹּעֵל), and a passive, *Pā'ūl* (פָּעוּל).¹

Pā'ūl is generally regarded as a survival of a passive of Qal, which still exists throughout in Arabic, but has been lost in Hebrew (see, however, § 52 e), just as in Aramaic the passives of *Pi'ēl* and *Hiph'il* are lost, except in the participles. But instances of the form *quṭṭāl* are better regarded as remnants of the passive participle Qal (see § 52 s), so that פָּעוּל must be considered as an original verbal noun; cf. Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 173 ff.

- b** 2. In the intransitive verbs *mid. e* and *mid. o*, the form of the participle active of Qal coincides in form with the 3rd sing. of the perfect, e. g. יָשָׁן *sleeping*, from יָשַׁן; יָגֹר (only orthographically different from the perf. יָגַר) *fearing*; cf. the formation of the participle in *Niph'al*, § 51 a. On the other hand, the participle of verbs *mid. a* takes the form קָטַל (so even from the transitive שָׂנֵא *to hate*, part. שֹׂנֵא). The *ō* of these forms has arisen through an obscuring of the *ā*, and is therefore unchangeable, cf. § 9 g. The form קָטַל (with a changeable *Qameṣ* in both syllables), which would correspond to the forms יָשָׁן and יָגַר, is only in use as a noun, cf. § 84^a f. The formation of the participle in *Pi'ēl*, *Hiph'il*, and *Hithpa'ēl* follows a different method.

- c** 3. Participles form their feminine (קָטְלָה or קָטְלָת) and their plural like other nouns (§ 80 e, § 84^a r, s, § 94).

- d** Rem. 1. From the above it follows, that the *ā* of the form יָשָׁן is lengthened from *ä*, and consequently changeable (e. g. fem. יָשְׁנָה); and that the *ō* of קָטַל on the other hand is obscured from an unchangeable *ā*.¹ In Arabic the verbal adjective of the form *qātil* corresponds to the form *qāṭil*, and the part. *qātil* to *qōṭel*. In both cases, therefore, the *ē* of the second syllable is lengthened from *ī*, and is consequently changeable (e. g. קָטַל, plur. קָטְלִים; בָּבֵר, constr. pl. בָּבְרִי).

- e** תּוֹמִיךָ ψ 16⁵, instead of the form *qōṭel*, is an anomaly; it is possible, however, that תּוֹמִיךָ (incorrectly written fully) is intended (cf. סָבִיב 2 K 8²¹), or even the imperfect *Hiph'il* of יָמַךְ. The form יָסַף in Is 29¹⁴, 38⁵ appears to stand for יָסַף, but most probably the Masora here (as certainly in יוֹסִיף Ec 1¹⁸) intends the 3rd sing. imperf. *Hiph.*, for which the better form would be יוֹסֵף; אוֹבִיל 1 Ch 27³⁰, being a proper name and a foreign word, need not be considered.—אָבֵר (constr. state of אָבֵר, with *ā* in the second syllable, occurs in Dt 32²⁸ (cf. moreover, § 65 d). On הוֹלֵם Is 41⁷ (for הוֹלֵם), see § 29 f.

- f** 2. A form like the pass. ptep. *Pā'ūl*, but not to be confused with it, is sometimes found from intransitive verbs, to denote an inherent quality, e. g. אֱמוּן *faithful*; אֲנָשׁ *desperate*, Jer 15¹⁸, &c.; בְּטוּחַ *trustful*, Is 26³, ψ 112⁷; עָצוּם *strong*; שָׂכָר *drunken*, Is 51²¹; and even from transitive verbs, אֲחִזָּז *handling*, Ct 3⁸; זָכוּר *mindful*, ψ 103¹⁴; ידוֹעַ *knowing*, Is 53³; cf. § 84^a m.

¹ The constr. st. נָאֵם in the formula נָאֵם יְהוָה *the word* (properly the *whispering*) of the Lord, &c., is always written defectively.

² Cf. Vollers, 'Das Qātil-partizipium,' in ZA. 1903, p. 312 ff.

B. VERBA DERIVATIVA, OR DERIVED CONJUGATIONS.

§ 51. *Niph'al*.¹

1. The essential characteristic of this conjugation consists in a *a* prefix² to the stem. This exists in two forms: (a) the (probably original) prepositive *nā*, as in the Hebrew perfect and participle, although in the strong verb the *ā* is always attenuated to *i*: נִקְטַל for original *nā-qātāl*, participle נִקְטֵל, infinitive absolute sometimes נִקְטֹל; (b) the (later) proclitic *in* (as in all the forms of the corresponding Arabic conjugation VII. 'inqātālā), found in the imperfect יִקְטַל for *yinqātēl*, in the imperative and infinitive construct, with a secondary *n* added, הִקְטַל (for *hinqātēl*), and in the infinitive absolute הִקְטֹל. The inflexion of *Niph'al* is perfectly analogous to that of *Qal*.

The features of *Niph'al* are accordingly in the perfect and participle the prefixed *Nūn*, in the imperative, infinitive, and imperfect, the *Dageš* in the first radical. These characteristics hold good also for the weak verb. In the case of an initial guttural, which, according to § 22 b, cannot take *Dageš forte*, the omission of the strengthening invariably causes the lengthening of the preceding vowel (see § 63 h).

2. As regards its meaning, *Niph'al* bears some resemblance to the *c* Greek *middle voice*, in being—(a) primarily *reflexive* of *Qal*, e.g. נִלְחַץ to thrust oneself (against), נִשְׁמַר to take heed to oneself, φυλάσσεσθαι, נִסְתַּר to hide oneself, נִנְצָל to redeem oneself; cf. also נִעֲנֶה to answer for oneself. Equally characteristic of *Niph'al* is its frequent use to express emotions which react upon the mind; נָחַם to trouble oneself, נִנְאֹחַ to sigh (to bemoan oneself, cf. ὀδύρεσθαι, lamentari, contristari); as well as to express actions which the subject allows to happen to himself, or to have an effect upon himself (*Niph'al tolerativum*), e.g. דָּרַשׁ to search, to inquire, Niph. to allow oneself to be inquired of, Is 65¹, Ez 14³, &c.; so the Niph. of מָצָא to find, יָסַר to warn, to correct, Jer 6⁸, 31¹⁸, &c.

(b) It expresses *reciprocal* or mutual action. e.g. דִּבֶּר to speak, Niph. d to speak to one another; שָׁפַט to judge, Niph. to go to law with one another; יָעַץ to counsel, Niph. to take counsel, cf. the middle and deponent verbs βουλευέσθαι (νῴεῖν), μάχεσθαι (ἐλῆχεῖν), altercari, luctari (הִנָּחַץ to strive with one another) proeliari.

(c) It has also, like *Hithpa'el* (§ 54 f) and the Greek *middle*, the *e* meaning of the active, with the addition of *to oneself* (*sibi*), for one-

¹ Cf. A. Rieder, *De linguae Hebr. verbis, quae vocantur derivata nifal et hitpael*, Gumbinnen (Progr. des Gymn.), 1884, a list of all the strong *Niph'al* forms (81) and *Hithpa'el* forms (36) in the Old Testament; and especially M. Lambert, 'L'emploi du Nifal en Hébreu,' *REJ.* 41, 196 ff.

² See Philippi in *ZDMG.* 1886, p. 650, and Barth, *ibid.* 1894, p. 8 f.

self, e. g. נִשְׂאֵל to ask (something) for oneself (1 S 20^{6,28}, Neh 13⁶), cf. αἰτοῦμαι σε τοῦτο, ἐνδύσασθαι χιτῶνα, to put on (oneself) a tunic.

f (d) In consequence of a looseness of thought at an early period of the language, *Niph'al* comes finally in many cases to represent the passive¹ of *Qal*, e. g. יָלַד to bear, *Niph.* to be born; קָבַר to bury, *Niph.* to be buried. In cases where *Qal* is intransitive in meaning, or is not used, *Niph'al* appears also as the passive of *Pi'el* and *Hiph'il*, e. g. כָּבַד to be in honour, *Pi'el* to honour, *Niph.* to be honoured (as well as *Pu'al* כִּבְּד); פָּחַד *Pi'el* to conceal, *Hiph.* to destroy, *Niph.* passive of either. In such cases *Niph'al* may again coincide in meaning with *Qal* (חָלַה *Qal* and *Niph.* to be ill) and even take an accusative.

g Examples of denominatives are, נִנְיָר to be born a male, Ex 34¹⁹ (from יָנַר; but probably הִנְיָר should here be read); נִלְבָּב cordatum fieri, Jb 11¹² (from לָבַב cor); doubtless also נִבְנָה to obtain children, Gn 16², 30³.

h The older grammarians were decidedly wrong in representing *Niph'al* simply as the passive of *Qal*; for *Niph'al* has (as the frequent use of its imperat. shows), in no respect the character of the other passives, and in Arabic a special conjugation (*inqātālā*) corresponds to it with a passive of its own. Moreover, the forms mentioned in § 52 e point to a differently formed passive of *Qal*.—The form נִנְיָלִי Is 59³, La 4¹⁴, is not to be regarded as a passive of *Niph'al*, but with König and Cheyne as a *forma mixta*, in the sense that the punctuators intended to combine two optional readings, נִנְיָלִי, perf. *Niph.*, and נִנְיָלִי, perf. *Pu'al* [cf. also Wright, *Compar. Gramm.*, p. 224]. Although the passive use of *Niph'al* was introduced at an early period, and became tolerably common, it is nevertheless quite secondary to the reflexive use.

i Rem. 1. The *infin. absol.* נִקְטֹל is connected in form with the perfect, to which it bears the same relation as קָטַל to קָטַל in *Qal*, the *δ* in the second syllable being obscured from an original *ā*. Examples are, נִכְסֹף Gn 31³⁰; נִלְחֹם Ju 11²⁵; נִשְׂאֵל 1 S 20^{6,28}, all in connexion with the perfect.

k Examples of the form הִקְטַל (in connexion with imperfects) are, הִנְתַּן Jer 32⁴; הִאָּכַל Lv 7¹⁸; once אִדְרַשׁ Ez 14³, where, perhaps, the subsequent אִדְרַשׁ has led to the substitution of מ for ה.—Moreover, the form הִקְטַל is not infrequently used also for the *infin. absol.*,² e. g. Ex 22³, Nu 15³¹, Dt 4²⁶, 1 K 20³⁹. On the other hand, בִּהְנִדֵּף should simply be read for the wholly abnormal בִּהְנִדֵּף ψ 68³ (commonly explained as being intended to correspond in sound with the subsequent הִנְדֵּף, but probably a 'forma mixta', combining the readings בִּהְנִדֵּף and בִּנְדֵּף).

¹ Cf. Halfmann, *Beiträge zur Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*, 1. Stück, Wittenb., 1888, 2. St. 1892 (Gymn.-Programm), statistics of the *Niph'al* (*Pu'al*, *Hoph'al*, and *qātūl*) forms at different periods of the language, for the purpose of ascertaining the meaning of *Niph.* and its relation to the passive; the selection of periods is, however, very questionable from the standpoint of literary criticism.

² But, like הִקְטַל, only in connexion with imperfects, except Jer 7⁹. Barth is therefore right in describing (*Nominalbildung*, p. 74) both forms as later analogous formations (in addition to the original Semitic נִקְטֹל), intended to assimilate the infinitive to the imperfect which it strengthens.

Elision of the ה after prepositions is required by the Masora in בְּבִשְׁלוֹ Pr l 24¹⁷ (for בְּהִכּוֹ), בְּהִרְגוֹ Ez 26¹⁵ and בְּעִטְיָה La 2¹¹; also in verbs לִ"ה Ex 10³ (לִעֲנוֹת); 34²¹ and Is 1¹² (לִרְאוֹת); in verbs עָוִי Jb 33³⁰ (לְאוֹר). It is, however, extremely doubtful whether the *infin. Qal* of the *Ke'ithibh* is not rather intended in all these examples; it certainly is so in La 2¹¹, cf. ψ 61³.

2. Instead of the *Sere* in the ultima of the imperfect, *Pathah* often occurs *m* in pause, e.g. וַיִּזְמַל Gn 21⁸; cf. Ex 31¹⁷, 2 S 12¹⁵ (with final שׁ); 17²³ (with ק); Jon 1⁵ (with מ); see § 29 g. In the 2nd and 3rd plur. fem. *Pathah* predominates, e.g. תִּזְכְּרֶנָּה Is 65¹⁷; *Sere* occurs only in תִּעֲנֶנָּה Ru 1³, from עָנָה, and hence, with loss of the doubling, for תִּעֲנֶנָּה; cf. even תִּאֲמַנָּה Is 60⁴.—With *Nūn paragodicum* (see § 47 m) in the 2nd and 3rd plur. masc. are found, וַיִּלְכְּדוּ, וַיִּתְּחַמְּנוּ, &c., in pause וַיִּבְהֲלוּ, וַיִּשְׁמְדוּ, &c.; but Jb 19²¹ (cf. 24²¹) וַיִּחַצְּבוּ.

3. When the imperfect, the infinitive (in *ē*), or the imperative is followed *n* in close connexion by a monosyllable, or by a word with the tone on the first syllable, the tone is, as a rule (but cf. וַיֵּאבֶק אִישׁ Gn 32²⁵), shifted back from the ultima to the penultima, while the ultima, which thus loses the tone, takes *S^eghôl* instead of *Sere*; e.g. וַיִּבְשֵׁל בָּהּ Ez 33¹²; לוֹ וַיַּעֲתֶר Gn 25²¹; in the imperative, 13⁹.—So always הִשְׁמֵר לָךְ (since לָךְ counts as *one* syllable) Gn 24⁶, &c., cf. 1 S 19²; and even with *Pathah* in the ultima, הִעָּוֶב אֶרֶץ Jb 18⁴ (but cf. וַיַּעֲתֵר אֱלֹהִים 2 S 21¹⁴). Although in isolated cases (e.g. Gn 32²⁵, Ezr 8²³) the tone is not thrown back, in spite of a tone-syllable following, the retraction has become usual in certain forms, even when the next word begins with a toneless syllable; especially after *consec.*, e.g. וַיִּשְׁאָר Gn 7²³; וַיִּלָּחֶם Nu 21¹ and frequently, וַיִּצְמָד 25³; and always so in the imperative הִשְׁמֵר Ex 23²¹, Jb 36²¹, and (before Metheg of the counter-tone) Dt 24⁸, 2 K 6⁹. On the avoidance of pausal-forms in the imperative (Am 2¹² with *Silluq*, Zc 2¹¹ with *Athnah*), and imperfect (Pr 24⁴, &c.), see § 29 o, and note; on the other hand, always הִפְלִיט, הִפְלִיט, &c.

In the *imperative*, נִקְבְּצֵה, for הִקְבְּצֵה, with the rejection of the initial ה, O occurs in Is 43⁹, and in Joel 4¹¹ in pause נִקְבְּצֵה (cf. נָלוֹ Jer 50⁵); but in these examples either the reading or the explanation is doubtful. The 2nd sing. imperat. of נִשְׁבַּע is always (with ה *paragodicum*) לִי הִשְׁבַּעָה swear to me, Gn 21²⁸, &c. (also לִי הִשְׁבַּעָה Gn 47³¹, 1 S 30¹⁵).

4. For the 1st sing. of the *imperfect*, the form אֶשְׁטַל is as frequent as אֶשְׁטַל, p e.g. אֶדְרֹשׁ I shall be inquired of, Ez 14³; אֶשְׁבַּע I will swear, Gn 21²⁴; cf. 16², Nu 23¹⁵, Ez 2c³⁶, and so always in the cohortative, e.g. אֶנְקָמָה I will avenge me, Is 1²⁴; cf. 1 S 12⁷, Ez 26², and in the impf. Niph. of פָּ"ו (§ 69 t). The Babylonian punctuation admits only ך under the preformative of the 1st person.

§ 52. Pi'el and Pu'al.

1. The *characteristic* of this conjugation consists in the strengthening *a* of the middle radical. From the simple stem *qatal* (cf. § 43 b) the form קָטַל (cf. the Arabic conj. II. qattālā) would naturally follow as

the *perfect* of the active (*Pi'el*). The *Pathah* of the first syllable is, however, with one exception (see *m*), always attenuated to *i* in the *perfect*. In the second syllable, *ā* has been retained in the majority of cases, so that the conjugation should more correctly be called *Pi'al*; but very frequently ¹ this *ā* also is attenuated to *i*, which is then regularly lengthened to *ē*, under the influence of the tone. Cf. in Aram. קָטַל; but in Biblical Aramaic almost always קָטַל. On the three cases in which *ā* before a final ר or ס has passed into *Seghōl*, see below, *l*.—Hence, for the 3rd sing. masc. perfect, there arise forms like אָבַד, קָדַשׁ, לָמַד; קָבַד, גָּדַד, &c.—Before affirmatives beginning with a consonant, however, *ā* is always retained, thus קָטַלְתָּם, קָטַלְתָּנִי, &c. In the *infinitives* (absol. קָטַל, obscured from *qattāl*; constr. קָטַל), *imperfect* (יִקְטֹל), *imperative* (קָטַל), and *participle* (מִקְטֹל) the original *ā* of the first syllable reappears throughout. The vocal *Šewā* of the preformatives is weakened from a short vowel; cf. the Arabic imperfect *yūqattil*, participle *mūqattil*.

b The *passive* (*Pu'al*) is distinguished by the obscure vowel *ū*, or very rarely *ō*, in the first syllable, and *ā* (in pause *ā*) always in the second. In Arabic, also, the passives are formed throughout with *ū* in the first syllable. The inflexion of both these conjugations is analogous to that of *Qal*.

c Rem. 1. The preformative פ, which in the remaining conjugations also is the prefix of the participle, is probably connected with the interrogative or indefinite (cf. § 37) pronoun מִי *quis? quicunque* (fem. i. e. neuter, מִיָּה); cf. § 85 e.

d 2. The *Dageš forte*, which according to the above is characteristic of the whole of *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*, is often omitted (independently of verbs *middle guttural*, § 64 d) when the middle radical has *Šewā* under it (cf. § 20 m), e. g. שָׁלַח for שִׁלַּח Ez 17¹⁷; בָּקַשׁוּ 2 Ch 15¹⁵ (but in the *imperative* always בִּקְשׁוּ 1 S 28⁷, &c.), and so always in הִלְלוּ *praise*. The vocal character of the *Šewā* under the *littera dagessanda* is sometimes in such cases (according to § 10 h) expressly emphasized by its taking the form of a *Ḥateph*, as in לִקְחָהּ Gn 2²³, with ִ owing to the influence of the preceding *u*, cf. פָּעֵלוּ for פָּעְלוּ, &c.; Gn 9¹⁴, Ju 16¹⁶. In the *imperfect* and *participle* the *Šewā* under the preformatives (*Ḥateph-Pathah* under מ in the 1st sing. *imperfect*) serves at the same time as a characteristic of both conjugations (Gn 26^{14 f.}).

e 3. According to the convincing suggestion of Böttcher² (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 904 ff. and § 1022), many supposed perfects of *Pu'al* are in reality

¹ So in all verbs which end in *Nūn*, and in almost all which end in *Lamed* (Olsh. p. 538). Barth is probably right in supposing (*ZDMG*. 1894, p. 1 ff.) that the vowels of the strengthened perfects have been influenced by the *imperfect*.

² As Mayer Lambert observes, the same view was already expressed by Ibn Ġanālī (see above, § 3 d) in the *Kitāb el-luma'*, p. 161. Cf. especially Barth, 'Das passive Qal und seine Participien,' in the *Festschrift zum Jubiläum Hildeheimer* (Berlin, 1890), p. 145 ff.

passives of Qal. He reckons as such all those *perfects*, of which the *Pu'el* (which ought to express the corresponding active) is either not found at all, or only (as in the case of **יָלַד**) with a different meaning, and which form their *imperfect* from another conjugation, generally Niph'al. Such *perfects* are the *qūṭṭāl* form of the stems **אָבַל** (*imperfect* **תִּאֲבָלוּ** Is 1²⁰), **יָצַר**, **יָלַד**, **טָרַף**, **חָפַשׂ**, **נִשְׁפָּךְ**, **נִשְׁטָף**, **נִשְׁגַּל**, **עָבַד**, **לָקַח**. Barth (see below) adds to the list the apparent *Pu'ul-perfects* of **רָאָה**, **עָשָׂה**, **עֹזֵב**, **נָפַח**, **כָּרַת**, **חָצַב**, **זָנָה**, **בָּוֹז**, **אָסַר**, and of verbs with middle **ר** (hence with *ū* of the first syllable lengthened to *ō*), **הָרַג**, **הָרַג**, **שָׂרַף**; **קָרַא**, **מָרַט**, **טָרַף**, **זָרַק**, **זָרַע**, [זָרַח, see § 67 *m*], **Jb 3³** [זָרַח, see § 67 *m*], **הָרַז** **וְהָגִז** Is 59¹³. In these cases there is no need to assume any error on the part of the punctuators; the sharpening of the second radical may have taken place in order to retain the characteristic *ū* of the first syllable (cf. Arab. *qūṭṭālā* as passive of *qāṭālā*), and the *a* of the second syllable is in accordance with the vocalization of all the other passives (see § 39 *f*). Cf. § 52 *s* and § 53 *u*.

2. The fundamental idea of *Pi'el*, to which all the various shades of meaning in this conjugation may be referred, is *to busy oneself eagerly* with the action indicated by the stem. This intensifying of the idea of the stem, which is outwardly expressed by the strengthening of the second radical, appears in individual cases as—(a) a *strengthening* and *repetition* of the action (cf. the *intensive* and *iterative* nouns with the middle radical strengthened, § 84^b),¹ e. g. *לָחַץ* *to laugh*, *Pi'el to jest, to make sport* (to laugh repeatedly); *שָׁאַל* *to ask*, *Pi'el to beg*; hence when an action has reference to *many*, e. g. *קָבַר* *to bury* (a person) Gn 23⁴, *Pi'el to bury* (many) 1 K 11¹⁵, and often so in Syr. and Arab. Other varieties of the *intensive* and *iterative* meaning are, e. g. *פָּתַח* *to open*, *Pi'el to loose*; *סָפַר* *to count*, *Pi'el to recount*: [cf. *הִלְךָ, חָשַׁב, כָּתַב, מָצַח, מָהַח, תָּפַשׁ, תָּפַשׁ, רָפַא*].

The eager pursuit of an action may also consist in *urging* and *causing* others to do the same. Hence *Pi'el* has also—(b) a *causative* sense (like *Hiph'il*), e.g. לָמַד *to learn*, פִּי'el *to teach*. It may often be turned by such phrases as *to permit to*, *to declare or hold as* (the *declarative Pi'el*), *to help to*, e.g. תָּיָה *to cause to live*, צִדֵּק *to declare innocent*, יָלַד *to help in child-bearing*.

(c) *Denominatives* (see § 38 b) are frequently formed in this conjugation, and generally express a being occupied with the object expressed by the noun, either to form or to make use of it, e. g. קִנָּה *to make a nest, to nest* (from קָן), עָפַר *to throw dust, to dust* (from עָפָר),

¹ Analogous examples, in which the strengthening of a letter has likewise an intensive force, are such German words as *reichen*, *recken* (Eng. *to reach*, *to rack*); *streichen* (*stringo*), *strecken*: cf. *Strich* (a *stroke*), *Strecke* (a *stretch*); *wacker* from *wachen*; others, in which it has the causative sense, are *stechen*, *stecken*; *wachen* (*watch*), *wecken* (*wake*); τέλλω *to bring to an end* (cf. the stem τέλω *to end*, in τέλος, τελώ); γεννάω *to beget*, from the stem γένω *to come into being* (cf. γένος).

עָנַן to *gather the clouds together* (from עָנַן), שָׁלַשׁ to *divide in three parts*, or to *do a thing for the third time* (from שָׁלַשׁ); probably also דִּבֶּר to *speak*, from דִּבֶּר a *word*. Or again, the denominative may express taking away, injuring, &c., the object denoted by the noun (*privative* Pi'el, cf. our *to skin, to behead, to bone*), e.g. נִשְׂרַשׁ from שָׂרַשׁ to *root out, to extirpate*, וָנֶב prop. to *injure the tail* (וָנֶב), hence to *rout the rear of an army, to attack it*; לָבַב to *ravish the heart*; דָּשָׁן to *remove the ashes* (דָּשָׁן), הִפְטָא to *free from sin* (הִפְטָא), עָצַם to *break any one's bones* (עָצַם; cf., in the same sense, גָּרַם from גָּרַם); סָעַף to *lop the boughs*, Is 10³³ (from סָעַף a *bough*). Some words are clearly denominatives, although the noun from which they are derived is no longer found, e.g. סָקַל to *stone, to pelt with stones* (also used in this sense in Qal), and to *remove stones* (from a field), to *clear away stones*; cf. our *to stone*, used also in the sense of *taking out the stones from fruit*.

The meaning of the *passive* (Pu'al) follows naturally from the above, e.g. בִּקֵּשׁ Pi'el to *seek*, Pu'al to *be sought*.

i In Pi'el the literal, concrete meaning of the verb has sometimes been retained, when Qal has acquired a figurative sense, e.g. נָלַח, Pi'el to *uncover*, Qal to *reveal*, also to *emigrate*, i.e. to make the land bare.

k Also with an intransitive sense Pi'el occurs as an intensive form, but only in poetic language, e.g. חָתַת in Pi'el to *be broken in pieces*, Jer 51⁵⁶; פָּחַד to *tremble*, Is 51¹³, Pr 28¹⁴; רָוָה to *be drunken*, Is 34^{5,7}; [מָעַט to *be few*, Ec 12³]; but in Is 48⁸, 60¹¹ instead of the Pi'el of פָּתַח the Niph'al is certainly to be read, with Cheyne.

l Rem. 1. The (more frequent) form of the perfect with *Pathah* in the second syllable appears especially before *Maggeph* (Ec 5¹⁵, 12⁹) and in the middle of sentences in continuous discourse, but at the end of the sentence (in *pause*) the form with *Sere* is more common. Cf. נָדַל Is 49²¹ with נָדַל Jos 4¹⁴, Est 3¹; מָלַט Ez 33⁵ with מָלַט Ec 9¹⁵; קָצַץ 2 K 8¹⁶ with קָצַץ ψ 129⁴; but Qameṣ never appears in this pausal form. The 3rd sing. fem. in *pause* is always of the form קָטְלָה, except קָבְצָה Mi 1⁷; the 3rd plur. always as קָטְלוּ; the 2nd and 1st sing. and 1st plur. of course as קָטַלְתִּי, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתִּים (but always דִּבַּרְתִּי and שִׁפַּרְתִּי), קָטְלָנוּ. In the 3rd sing. perf. דִּבֶּר to *speak*, כִּפֶּר to *pardon*, and כָּבַם to *wash clothes* (also כָּבַם Gn 49¹¹) take *S'ghôl*, but become in *pause* דִּבֵּר, כִּפֵּם, כָּבַם (2 S 19²⁵); the *pausal* form of כִּפֶּר does not occur.

m *Pathah* in the first syllable (as in Aramaic and Arabic) occurs only once, Gn 41⁵¹, נָשִׁינִי he made me forget, to emphasize more clearly the play on the name מִנְשֵׁה.

n 2. In the imperfect (and *jussive* Ju 16²⁵), infinitive, and imperative Pi'el (as also in *Hithpa'el*) the *Sere* in the final syllable, when followed by *Maggeph*, is usually shortened into *S'ghôl*, e.g. יִבְקֹשׁ-לוּ he seeks for himself, Is 40²⁰; קִדִּישְׁ-לִי sanctify unto me, Ex 13². *Pausal-forms* with *S'ghôl* instead of *Sere*, as יִרְחַף Dt 32¹¹, אֶרְחֹם Ho 2⁶ (cf. Ex 32⁶ in the infinitive, and Gn 21⁹ in the participle), owe their origin to some particular school of Masoretes, and are wrongly accepted by Baer; cf. the analogous cases in § 75 n and hh. If the final syllable of the imperfect Pi'el has *Pathah* (before a guttural or ר), it remains

even in *pause*; cf. § 29 s and 65 e. In the 1st sing. imperfect the *e*-sound occurs in two words for *Hateph-Pathah*, under the preformative א; אֶרָאֵה Lv 26³³, Ez 5¹², 12¹⁴ and וְאֶסְעֶרֶם Ze 7¹⁴ (in accordance with § 23 h).—Before the full plural ending ון (see § 47 m) the *Sere* is retained in *pause*, e.g. תִּדְבְּרוּן ψ 58² (but Gn 32²⁰ תִּדְבְּרוּן), cf. 2 K 6¹⁹, Dt 12³; so before *Silluq* ψ 58³, Jb 21¹¹ and even before *Zaqeph qaton* Dt 7⁵. Instead of תִּקְטִילָהּ, forms like תִּקְטִילָהּ are also found, e.g. Is 3¹⁶, 13¹⁸, in both cases before a sibilant and in *pause*. Also פִּלֵּן ψ 55¹⁰ occurs as the 2nd sing. imperative (probably an intentional imitation of the sound of the preceding פִּלַּע) and קָרַב (for *qarrabh*) Ez 37¹⁷.

3. The *infinitive absolute* of Pi'el has sometimes the special form קָטַל given in *O* the paradigm, e.g. יַפֵּר castigando, ψ 118¹⁸; cf. Ex 21¹⁸, 1 K 19¹⁰ (from a verb א"ף); ψ 40² (from a verb ל"ה); but much more frequently the form of the *infinitive construct* (קָטַל) is used instead. The latter has also, in exceptional cases, the form קָטַל (with *ā* attenuated to *i* as in the *perfect*), e.g. in 1 Ch 8⁸ שָׁלַחוּ; perhaps also (if not a substantive) קָטַר Jer 44²¹; and for the sake of assonance even for *infinitive absolute* in 2 S 12¹⁴ (נָאֵץ נֶאֱצָה). On the other hand, שָׁלַם Dt 32³⁵ and דָּבַר Jer 5¹³ are better regarded as substantives, while דָּבַר Ex 6²⁸, Nu 3¹, Dt 4¹⁵ (in each case after בְּיָוִם), Ho 1² (after תְּהַלֵּל), in all of which places it is considered by König (after Qimḥi) to be *infinitive construct*, is really perfect of Pi'el.

The *infinitive construct* Pi'el, with the *fem.* ending (cf. § 45 d), occurs in יִסְרָה Lv 26¹⁸; וְיָמְרָה ψ 147¹; with ת of the *fem.* before a suffix צִדְקָתָהּ Ez 16⁵². On the verbal nouns after the form of the Aram. inf. Pa'il (קָטַלָהּ), see § 84^b e.

Instead of the abnormal מְאַסְפִּין (so Baer, Is 62⁹) as ptep. Pi'el, read מְאַסֵּה with ed. Mant. and Ginsburg.

4. In Pu'al *ō* is sometimes found instead of *ū* in the initial syllable, e.g. מְאֵדָה dyed red, Ex 25⁵, &c., Na 2⁴, cf. 3⁷ שִׁדְדָה; Ez 16⁴, ψ 72²⁰, 80¹¹. According to Baer's reading also in תִּרְצָחוּ ψ 62⁴, and so also Ben Ašer, but Ben Naphtali תִּרְצָחוּ. It is merely an orthographic licence when *ū* is written fully, e.g. יוֹלֵד Ju 18²⁹.

5. As *infinitive absolute* of Pu'al we find גָּלַב Gn 40¹⁵.—No instance of the *inf. constr.* occurs in the strong verb in Pu'al; from ל"ה with suffix עֲנוּתוֹ ψ 132¹.

6. A few examples occur of the *participle* Pu'al without the preformative (מְ), s e.g. אָפַל Ex 3²; יוֹלֵד (for מְיֹלֵד) Ju 13⁸; לָקַח 2 K 2¹⁰; כָּעָרָה Is 54¹¹. These *participles* are distinguished from the *perfect* (as in *Niph'al*) by the *ā* of the final syllable. For other examples, see Is 30²⁴, Ec 9¹² (where יוֹקִישִׁים, according to § 20 n, stands for 'ק' = מְק'); but, according to the Masora, not Ez 26¹⁷, since הִהֲלִילָהּ as *Mil'el* can only be the *perfect*. The rejection of the מְ may be favoured by an initial מ, as in Is 18^{2.7} (but also מְמַשֵּׁף); Pr 25¹⁹ (where, however, read מוֹעֲדָה); so also in the *participle* Pi'el מֵאֵן Ex 7²⁷, 9² (always after אֵם, but cf. also הַמֵּאֲנִים Jer 13¹⁰, where, however, הַמֵּאֲנִים = הַמֵּאֲנִים is to be read, with Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 264 f.) and מֵהָרָה Zp 1¹⁴ (and Is 81³?). Notice, however, Barth's suggestion (*Nominalbildung*, p. 273) that, as the active of forms like אָפַל only occurs in *Qal*, they are perfect participles of former *passives* of *Qal* (see e), and in Jer 13¹⁰, 23³², perfect participles of Pi'el.—On מְרַבֵּעַ Ez 45², see § 65 d.

§ 53. *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

a 1. The characteristic of the active (*Hiph'il*) is a prefixed ה (on its origin see § 55 i) in the perfect ה (with the *ā* attenuated to *ī*, as in *Pi'el*), which forms a closed syllable with the first consonant of the stem. The second syllable of the perfect had also originally an *ā*; cf. the Arabic conj. iv. 'aqṭālā, and in Hebrew the return of the *Pathah* in the 2nd and 1st pers. הִקְטִילָהּ, &c. After the attenuation of this *ā* to *ī*, it ought by rule to have been lengthened to *ē* in the tone-syllable, as in Aramaic אִקְטִיל, beside הִקְטִיל in Biblical Aramaic. Instead of this, however, it is always replaced in the strong verb by *i*,¹ —, but sometimes written defectively —; cf. § 9 g. Similarly in the infinitive construct הִקְטִיל, and in the imperfect and participle יִקְטִיל and מִקְטִיל, which are syncopated from יִהְיֶה־קְטִיל and מִיִּהְיֶה־קְטִיל; § 23 k. The corresponding Arabic forms (*juqṭil* and *muqṭil*) point to an original *ī* in the second syllable of these forms. In Hebrew the regular lengthening of this *ī* to *ē* appears in the strong verb at least in the *jussive* and in the *imperfect consecutive* (see n), as also in the *imperative* of the 2nd sing. masc. (see m); on הִקְטִילָהּ, הִקְטִילֶנָּה cf. § 26 p. On the return of the original *ā* in the second syllable of the *Imperat.*, *Jussive*, &c., under the influence of a guttural, cf. § 65 f.

b In the *passive* (*Hoph'al*) the preformative is pronounced with an obscure vowel, whilst the second syllable has *ā* (in pause *ā*), as its characteristic, thus:—*Perf.* הִקְטַל or הִקְטִיל, *Imperf.* יִקְטַל (syncopated from יִהְיֶה־קְטַל) or יִקְטִל, *Part.* מִקְטַל or מִקְטִל (from מִיִּהְיֶה־קְטַל); but the *infinitive absolute* has the form הִקְטִיל.

Thus the characteristics of both conjugations are the ה preformative in the *perfect*, *imperative*, and *infinitive*; in the *imperfect* and *participle* *Hiph'il*, *Pathah* under the preformatives, in the *Hoph'al* *ō* or *ū*.

c 2. The meaning of *Hiph'il* is primarily, and even more frequently than in *Pi'el* (§ 52 g), *causative* of *Qal*, e.g. הִצִּיץ to go forth, *Hiph.* to bring forth, to lead forth, to draw forth; הִקְדִּישׁ to be holy, *Hiph.* to sanctify. Under the *causative* is also included (as in *Pi'el*) the *declarative* sense, e.g. הִצִּדִּיק to pronounce just; הִרְשִׁיעַ to make one an evil doer (to pronounce guilty); cf. עָקַשׁ, in *Hiph'il*, Jb 9²⁰, to represent as perverse. If *Qal* has already a transitive meaning, *Hiph'il* then takes two accusatives (see § 117 cc). In some verbs, *Pi'el* and *Hiph'il* occur side by side in the same sense, e.g. אָבַד *periit*, *Pi'el* and *Hiph'il*, *perdidit*; as a rule,

¹ This *i* may have been transferred originally from the imperfects of verbs יִי, as a convenient means of distinction between the indicative and *jussive*, to the *imperfect* of the strong verb and afterwards to the whole of *Hiph'il*; so Stade, Philippi, Praetorius, ZAW. 1883, p. 52 f.

however, only one of these two conjugations is in use, or else they differ from one another in meaning, e.g. כָּבֵד *gravem esse*, Pi'el to honour, Hiph'il to bring to honour, also to make heavy. Verbs which are intransitive in *Qal* simply become transitive in *Hiph'il*, e.g. נָטָה to bow oneself, Hiph. to bow, to bend.

Among the ideas expressed by the *causative* and *transitive* are included, *d* moreover, according to the *Hebrew* point of view (and that of the *Semitic* languages in general, especially *Arabic*), a series of actions and ideas, which we have to express by periphrasis, in order to understand their being represented by the *Hiph'il*-form. To these *inwardly transitive* or *intensive* *Hiph'il*s belong: (a) *Hiph'il* stems which express the obtaining or receiving of a concrete or abstract quality. (In the following examples the *Qal* stems are given, for the sake of brevity, with the addition of the meaning which—often together with other meanings—belongs to the *Hiph'il*.) Thus יָפַע, זָהַר, אָהַל, יָפַע to be bright, to shine (to give forth brightness); opposed to הִשְׁךָ to become dark; גָּבַר, אָמַן, חָזַק to be strong (to develop strength), עָטַף to be weak; אָרַךְ to be long (to acquire length); גָּבַהּ to be high; הָוָה to be in tumult, זָעַק to cry out, רָוַע to make a noise, to exult; חָלַף to sprout (to put forth shoots), cf. פָּרַח to bloom, עָרַף, שָׁקַע to overflow; חָשָׂה, סָכַת, צָמַת to be silent (*silentium facere*, Pliny); מָתַק to be sweet; צָלַח to have success; נִשְׁפַּל to be low; אָדָם to become red, לָבָן to become white.

(b) Stems which express in *Hiph'il* the entering into a certain condition and, *e* further, the being in the same: אָמַן to become firm, to trust in; בָּאֵשׁ to become stinking; זָוַר to become boiling, to boil over; חָלָה to become ill; הָסַר to come to want; חָרָה to become hot; יָבֵשׁ to become dry, to become ashamed; יָתַר to attain superiority; נִשְׁכַּח to become familiar; קָוַן, עוֹרָה to become awake; קָשָׁה to become hard; רָנַע, נִשְׁקַט to become quiet (to keep quiet); נִשְׁמַם to be astonished. The *Hiph'il* forms of some verbs of motion constitute a variety of this class: נִגַּשׁ to draw near; קָרַב to come near; רָחַק to withdraw far off (all these three are besides used as *causatives*); קָדַם to come before.

(c) Stems which express action in some particular direction: חָטָא to err; *f* חָלַק to flatter (to act smoothly); יָטַב to act well, to do good; סָכַל to act foolishly, שָׁכַל to act wisely; עָרַם to act craftily; צָנַע to act submissively; רָעַע, רָשַׁע to act wickedly, godlessly; שָׁחַת, תָּעַב to act corruptly, abominably; שָׁלַם to act peacefully, to be at peace, to be submissive.

Further, there are in *Hiph'il* a considerable number of *denominatives* which *g* express the bringing out, the producing of a thing, and so are properly regarded as *causatives*,¹ e.g. אָצַר to set over the treasury, Neh 13¹³ (unless וְאֶצְרָה is to be read, as in Neh 7²); בָּרַךְ to bring forth a firstborn; גָּשַׁם to cause to rain; זָרַע to produce seed; יָמַן (*Hiph'il* הִימִין) to go to the right, cf. הִשְׁמָאֵל to go to the left; פָּרַם to get or to have hoofs; קָרַן to get or to have horns; נִשְׁכַּל to produce abortion; נִשְׁלַךְ to become snow-white; נִשְׁמַן to grow fat; נִשְׁרַשׁ to put forth roots, &c.; so also according to the ordinary acceptation הָאֲנִיחֵיהֶם Is 19⁶, they have become stinking, from אָנַח stinking or stench, with retention of the *N* prosthetic, § 19 *m* (but see below, *p*).

¹ The same ideas are also paraphrased by the verb עָשָׂה (to make), e.g. to make fat, for, to produce fat upon his body, Jb 15²⁷; to make fruit, to make branches, for, to put forth, to yield, Jb 14⁹, Ho 8⁷, cf. the Lat. *corpus*, *robur*, *sobole*, *divitias facere*, and the Ital. *far corpo*, *far forze*, *far frutto*.

Of a different kind are the *denominatives* from: אָזן (scarcely to prick up the ears, but) to act with the ears, to hear; cf. לָשׁן to move the tongue, to slander, and the German *äugeln* (to make eyes), *füsseln*, *nüseln*, *schwänzel*; שֶׁבֶר to sell corn; שָׂכַם to set out early (to load the back [of the camel, &c.] ?); opposed to הָעָרִיב.

h 3. The meaning of *Hoph'al* is (a) primarily that of a *passive* of *Hiph'il*, e.g. הִשְׁלִיךְ *proiecit*, הִשְׁלָךְ or הִשְׁלָךְ *proiectus est*; (b) sometimes equivalent to a *passive* of *Qal*, as נָקַם to *avenge*, *Hoph.* to *be avenged* (but see below, *u*).

i Rem. 1. The *i* of the 3rd sing. masc. perf. *Hiph'il* remains, without exception, in the 3rd fem. (in the tone-syllable). That it was, however, only lengthened from a short vowel, and consequently is changeable, is proved by the forms of the *imperative* and *imperfect* where *ē* (or, under the influence of gutturals, *ā*) takes its place. In an open syllable the *i* is retained almost throughout; only in very isolated instances has it been weakened to *Šewā* (see *n* and *o*).

k 2. The *infinitive absolute* commonly has *Sere* without *Yodh*, e.g. הַקָּדֵשׁ Ju 17³; less frequently it takes *Yodh*, e.g. הַשְׁמִיר Am 9⁸; cf. Dt 15¹⁴, Is 59⁴, Jer 3¹⁵, 23³², 44²⁵, Jb 34³⁵, Ec 10¹⁰. With *Mem* instead of *He* (probably a mere scribal error, not an Aramaism) we find אֲשַׁבֵּי Jer 25³. Rare exceptions, where the form with *Sere* stands for the *infinitive construct*, are, e.g. Dt 32⁸ (Sam. בְּהִנְחִיל; read perhaps בְּהִנְחָל), Jer 44^{19.25}, Pr 25², Jb 13³ (?); on the other hand, for לַעֲשֹׂךְ Dt 26¹² (which looks like an *infinitive Hiph'il* with elision of the *He*, for לְהַעֲשִׂיר) the right reading is simply לַעֲשֹׂךְ, since elsewhere the *Pi'el* alone occurs with the meaning *to tithe*; for בַּעֲשֹׂךְ Neh 10³⁹ perhaps the inf. *Qal* (בַּעֲשֹׂךְ) was intended, as in 1 S 8^{16.17} (= *to take the tithe*). At the same time it is doubtful whether the present punctuation does not arise from a conflation of two different readings, the *Qal* and the *Pi'el*.

l Instead of the ordinary form of the *infinitive construct* הַקָּטִיל the form הַקָּטִיל sometimes occurs, e.g. הַשְׁמִיר to *destroy*, Dt 7²⁴, 28⁴⁸; cf. Lv 14⁴⁶, Jos 11¹⁴, Jer 50³⁴, 51³³ and הַקָּצוֹחַ for הַקָּצוֹחַ Lv 14⁴³ from קָצַח; scarcely, however, Lv 7³⁵ (see § 155 *l*), 2 S 22¹ (ψ 18¹), 1 K 11¹⁶ (after עָר), and in the passages so explained by König (i. 276) where הַשְׁאִיר appears after prepositions¹; [cf. Driver on Dt 3³, 4¹⁵, 7²⁴, 28⁵⁵].

With *ā* in the second syllable there occurs הוֹבִירָם Ez 21²⁹ (cf. the substantival infin. הוֹבִירָ 1 S 15²³).—In the *Aram. manner* הַשְׁמַעוֹת is found in Ez 24²⁶ (as a *construct form*) for the *infinitive Hiph'il* (cf. the *infinitive Hithpa'el*, Dn 11²³). On the elision of the *He* after prefixes, see *q*.

m 3. In the *imperative* the *i* is retained throughout in the open syllable, according to *i*, and consequently also before suffixes (see § 61 *g*) and הַ— *paragogic*, e.g. הַקְשִׁיבָה attend to, פָּא הוֹשִׁיעָה ψ 118²⁵, as in ed. Mant., Jabl., Baer, not פָּא הוֹשִׁיעָה as Ginsb. and Kittel; with the tone at the end only הַחֲלִיחָה ibid. v. 25⁵. On the other hand, in the 2nd sing. masc. the original *i* (cf. Arabic *ʾaqlīl*) is lengthened to *ē*, e.g. הַשְׁמֵן make fat, and becomes *Sēghōl* before *Maqqeph*, e.g. הַסְבִּירָנָה Jb 22²¹.—The form הַקָּטִיל for הַקָּטִיל appears anomalously a few times: ψ 94¹, Is 43⁸, Jer 17¹⁸ (cf. § 69 *v* and § 72 *y*); elsewhere the *Masora* has preferred the punctuation הַקָּטִיל, e.g. 2 K 8⁶; cf. ψ 142⁵.—In La 5¹ הַבִּיטָה is required by the *Qerê* for הַבִּיט.

¹ As to the doubtfulness, on general grounds, of this form of the Inf. *Hiph.*, see Robertson Smith in the *Journ. of Philol.*, xvi. p. 72 f.

4. In the *imperfect* *Hiph'il* the shorter form with *Šere* prevails for the jussive *n* in the 3rd masc. and fem. and 2nd masc. sing., e.g. אֲלֹהֵיךָ make not great, Ob 12; יְכַרֵּת let Him cut off! ψ 124; even incorrectly תִּיָּד Ex 193 and יָיִד Ec 1020; cf. also יְבַעֵר Ex 224, where the jussive form is to be explained according to § 109 h, and יֵאָבֵד Jb 3920 before the principal pause. Similarly, after ו consec., e.g. וַיִּבְדֵּל and He divided, Gn 14. On the other hand, *i* is almost always retained in the 1st sing., e.g. וְאֲשַׁמֵּד Am 29 (but generally without *i*, as וְאֲסַתֵּר Ez 3923 f., &c.); cf. § 49 e and § 74 l, but also § 72 aa; in 1st plur. only in Neh 43; in the 3rd sing. ψ 10528. With *ā* in the principal pause וְהוֹרֵת Ru 214, and in the lesser pause, Gn 494; before a sibilant (see § 29 g) וַיִּגַּשׁ Ju 619; in the lesser pause וַיִּקַּח La 35. Before *Maqqeph* the *Šere* becomes *S^gghôl*, e.g. וַיִּהְיוּ־קִפּוֹ Ju 194. In the plural again, and before suffixes, *i* remains in the forms יִקְטִילוּ, יִקְטִילוּ, even in the jussive and after ו consecutive, e.g. וַיִּדְבְּרוּ Ju 1822. The only exceptions, where the *i* is weakened to *Šewā*, are יִדְרֹכֶנּוּ Jer 92; וַיִּרְבְּקוּ 1 S 1422, 312, 1 Ch 102; יַעֲבֹדוּ Jer 1115; וְאֹאצְרָה Neh 1313, if it is *Hiph'il* of אָצַר, but probably וְאֹאצְנָה is to be read, as in 72; perhaps also תִּהְבְּרוּ Jb 193 (according to others, *imperfect Qal*). The same weakening occurs also in the imperfect in 3rd and 2nd masc. sing. before suffixes, 1 S 1725, 1 K 2033, ψ 6516, and in Jb 920, unless the form be *Pi'el*=וַיַּעֲקֹשְׁנִי, since the *Hiph'il* is not found elsewhere. It is hardly likely that in these isolated examples we have a trace of the ground-form, *yaqtîl*, or an Aramaism. More probably they are due partly to a misunderstanding of the defective writing, which is found, by a purely orthographic licence, in numerous other cases (even in 3rd sing. יִשְׁלַח Is 4428), and partly are intended, as *formae mixtae*, to combine the forms of *Qal* and *Hiph'il*. Instead of the firmly closed syllable, the Masora requires in Gn 111 תִּרְשָׁא, with euphonic Ga'ya (see § 16 h).

5. In the *participle*, מֹאצֵּא ψ 1357 appears to be traceable to the ground-form, *O maqtîl*; yet the *Šere* may also possibly be explained by the retraction of the tone. The Masora appears to require the weakening of the vowel to *Šewā* (see above, n) in מְהַלְכִים Ze 37 (probably, however, מְהַלְכִים should be read), also in מְהַלְמִים Jer 298, מַעֲזִירִים 2 Ch 2823 (but as ׀ precedes, and accordingly dittography may well have taken place, the participle *Qal* is probably to be read in both places; the reading of the text is perhaps again intended to combine *Qal* and *Hiph'il*, see above, n), and in the מְהַצְרִים 1 Ch 1524 &c. (where the *Kethibh* מַחֲצִצִּים is better).—The fem. is ordinarily pointed as מְבַרֶּת Nu 515, מִשְׁנֶת Lv 1421; in pause מִשְׁבֶּלֶת Pr 1914.

6. In the *perfect* there occur occasionally such forms as הִכְלַמְנִי 1 S 257; p cf. Gn 4128, 2 K 1711, Jer 291, Mi 63, Jb 167; with the original *ā* in the first syllable הִרְאֵיתִי Na 35.—In אֶנְאֵלְתִי 1 I have stained, Is 633, א stands at the beginning instead of ה, cf. above, k, on אֶשְׂבִּים. On the other hand, הִתְאֵלְתִּי

¹ Most probably, however, הִתְאֵלְתִּי (*perfect Pi'el*) is to be read, and the א is only an indication of the change of the *perfect* into the *imperfect*, as also previously, by a change of punctuation, וְאֶדְרֹכֶם and וְיִי (instead of וְאֶדְרֹךְ and וְיִי) are made future instead of past. Jewish exegesis applied these Edom-oracles to the Roman (i.e. Christian) empire. So G. Moore in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1887, col. 292.

Is 10⁶ (see above, *g*) is a mere error of the scribe, who had the Aramaic form in mind and corrected it by prefixing ה.

q 7. In the *imperfect* and *participle* the characteristic ה is regularly elided after the preformatives, thus יִקְטִיל, יִקְטִיל; but it is retained in the *infinitive* after prepositions, e.g. לְהִקְטִיל. The exceptions are in the imperfect, יִהְיֶה, יִהְיֶה; He will save for יִשְׁעֵי 1 S 17⁴⁷, ψ 116⁶ (in pause); יִהְיֶה; He will praise for יִהְיֶה Neh 11¹⁷, ψ 28⁷, 45¹⁸ (cf. the proper name יְהוֹכָד Jer 37³, for which יִבְל [and יְהוֹסֵף ψ 81⁶]); [יְהוֹלִיל] (§ 70 *d*) Is 52⁵, יְהוֹלִיל Jer 9⁴, יְהוֹלִיל Jb 13⁹] and לְהִקְצֹעַ Ez 46²²; in the *infinitive* (where, however, as in *Niph'al*, § 51 *l*, the *infinitive Qal* is generally to be read) לְהִסְתַּר Is 29¹⁵ for לְהִסְתַּר; לְנַפֵּל and לְצַבּוֹת Nu 5²²; לְעִבִּיר 2 S 19¹⁹; לְהִלָּךְ Jer 37¹²; לְהִטִּיא Ec 5⁵; לְלָבֵן (doubly anomalous for לְהִלָּבֵן) Dn 11³⁵; לְשַׁמֵּעַ ψ 26⁷; לְאָדִיב 1 S 23³; לְשַׁמֵּד Is 23¹¹; וּלְשַׁבִּית Am 8⁴ (certainly corrupt); בָּעִיר for בְּהָעִיר ψ 73²⁰ (but in the city is probably meant); לְבִיא Jer 39⁷ (2 Ch 31¹⁰); לְמָרוֹת Is 3⁸, ψ 78¹⁷; לְנַחֲתָם Ex 13²¹; בְּנִלוֹת (see, however, § 20 *h*) Is 33¹; לְרִאֲתָכֶם Dt 1³³: cf. further, from verbs לָה, Nu 5²², Jer 27²⁰; on Dt 26¹² and Neh 10³⁹, see above, *k*; for לְמַחוֹת Pr 31³ read לְמַחוֹת or לְמַחוֹת.

r 8. With regard to the tone it is to be observed that the affirmatives ו and ה in Hiph'il have not the tone, even in the *perfect* with *uaw* consecutive (except in Ex 26³³ before ה, Lv 15²⁹ before א, to avoid a hiatus); but the plural ending ון (see § 47 *m*) always has the tone, e.g. הִתְקַרְבוּ Dt 1¹⁷.

s 9. The passive (Hoph'al) has *ä* instead of Qames ḥaṭuṭh in the first syllable (הִקְטַל), in the strong verb less frequently in the perfect and infinitive, but generally in the participle, through the influence of the initial מ (but cf. מִשְׁחַת Pr 25²⁶); e.g. הִשְׁכַּב Ez 32³² (beside הִשְׁכַּב 32¹⁹); הִשְׁלַךְ *impf.* יִשְׁלַךְ, *part.* מִשְׁלַךְ 2 S 20²¹ (beside הִשְׁלַכְתָּ Is 14¹⁹); הִמְלִיחַ Ez 16⁴; in the partic. Hoph. without elision of the ה: מְהַקְצֹעַ Ez 46²²; on the other hand, verbs פ"נ always have *ä* (in a sharpened syllable): הִפְדָּה, הִפְדָּה (cf. § 9 *n*).

t 10. The *infinitive absolute* has in Hoph'al (as in Hiph'il) *Sere* in the last syllable, e.g. הִחַתַּל and הִמְלִיחַ Ez 16⁴; הִפְדָּה Jos 9²⁴. An *infinitive construct* does not occur in the strong verb.

11. With regard to the *imperative Hoph'al*, see above, § 46 *a*, note.

u 12. According to Böttcher (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 906) and Barth (see above, § 52 *e*) a number of supposed imperfects Hoph'al are, in fact, imperfects of the passive of *Qal*. As in the case of the perfects passive of *Qal* (see above, § 52 *e*) the question is again of verbs of which neither the corresponding causative (i. e. here the Hiph'il), nor the other tense of the same conjugation (i. e. here the perfect Hoph'al) is found; so with יָפַם (for יָנַם, cf. *yugtālū* as imperfect *Qal* in Arabic) and יָפַן, from נָפַם and נָתַן; יָפַח from לָקַח (cf. § 66 *g*); יָאָר Nu 22⁶ from אָרַר; יָחַן from חָנַן; יָשָׁר Ho 10¹⁴ (cf. Is 33¹) from שָׁרַר; Barth adds the verbs יָפַן Ez 19¹² from נָחַשׁ; יָפַן Lev 11³⁵ from נָחַן; the verbs עָעָ יָקָו Jb 19²³ from חָקַק; יָפַת &c. from בָּתַת; the verb עָעָ יָדַשׁ from דָּשַׁן; the verbs עָעָ יָחַל; יָשָׁר, יָשַׁת from חָלַל; יָשַׁר and יָשַׁת. On יָשַׁם &c., § 73 *f*. In point of fact it would be very strange, especially in the case of יָפַן and יָפַח, that of these frequently used verbs,

amongst all the forms of Hiph'il and Hoph'al, only the *imperfect* Hoph'al should have been preserved. A passive of Qal is also indicated in the Tell-el-Amarna letters, according to Knudtzon, by a number of imperfect forms, which are undoubtedly due to Canaanite influence, cf. *Beitr. zur Assyriologie*, iv. 410.

§ 54. *Hithpa'el*.

1. The *Hithpa'el*¹ is connected with *Pi'el*, being formed by prefixing *a* to the *Pi'el*-stem (*qattēl*, *qattal*) the syllable הִתְ (Western Aramaic הִתְ, but in Biblical Aramaic הִתְ; Syr. 'et²). Like the preformative הִ (הִתְ) of *Niph'al*, הִתְ has also a reflexive force.

2. The ה of the prefix in this conjugation, as also in *Hothpa'al* *b* (see *h*), *Hithpa'el*, *Hithpa'el* and *Hithpael* (§ 55), under certain circumstances, suffers the following changes:

(a) When the stem begins with one of the harder sibilants ס, צ, or ש, the ה and the sibilant change places (cf. on this *metathesis*, § 19 *n*), and at the same time the ה after a צ becomes the corresponding emphatic ט: thus הִשְׁתַּמֵּר to *take heed to oneself*, for הִתְשַׁמֵּר; הִתְסַבֵּל to *become burdensome*, for הִתְסַבֵּל; הִצְטַדֵּק to *justify oneself*, from צַדִּיק. The only exception is in Jer 49³, וְהִתְשַׁמְטָנָה, to avoid the cacophony of three successive *t*-sounds.

(b) When the stem begins with a *d*- or *t*-sound (ד, ט, ת), the ה of *c* the preformative is assimilated to it (§ 19 *d*), e.g. מְדַבֵּר *speaking, conversing*; הִדְרָא to *be crushed*, הִטְהַר to *purify oneself*, הִטְמֵא to *defile oneself*, הִתְהַלַּם to *act uprightly*. (An exception occurs in Ju 19²².) The assimilation of the ה occurs also with נ and כ, e.g. הִנְבֵּא to *prophecy*, as well as הִתְנַבֵּא (cf. Nu 24⁷, Ez 5¹³, Dn 11¹⁴); תִּבְיוֹן Nu 21²⁷ (cf. Is 54¹⁴, ψ 59⁵); תִּבְצֵה Pr 26²⁶; with ש Ec 7¹⁶; with ר Is 33¹⁰.

Rem. Metathesis would likewise be expected, as in the cases under *b*, *d* when ה and י come together, as well as a change of ה to ד. Instead of this, in the only instance of the kind (הִיבִי Is 1¹⁶) the ה is assimilated to the י, —unless indeed הִיבִי, *imperative Niph'al* of וְכִי, is intended.

3. As in form, so also in meaning, *Hithpa'el* is primarily (a) *reflexive* of *Pi'el*, e.g. הִתְאַוֵּר to *gird oneself*, הִתְקַדֵּשׁ to *sanctify oneself*. Although in these examples the intensive meaning is not distinctly marked, it is so in other cases, e.g. הִתְנַקֵּם to *show oneself revengeful* (*Niph.* simply *to take revenge*), and in the numerous instances where the *Hithpa'el* expresses *to make oneself* that which is predicated by the stem, *to conduct oneself* as such, *to show oneself*, *to imagine oneself*, *to*

¹ A. Stein, *Der Stamm des Hithpael im Hebr.* pt. 1, Schwerin, 1893, gives alphabetical statistics of the 1151 forms.

² So also in Hebrew אֶתְחַבֵּר 2 Ch 20²⁵; cf. ψ 76⁶ (אֶשְׁתַּחֲוֶה).

affect to be of a certain character. E. g. הִתְגַּדַּל *to make oneself great, to act proudly*; הִתְחַכֵּם *to show oneself wise, crafty*; הִתְחַלֵּה *to pretend to be ill*; הִתְעַשֵּׂר *to make, i. e. to feign oneself rich*; הִשְׁתַּרַר Nu 16¹³, *to make oneself a prince*; הִתְנַבֵּא I S 18¹⁰, *to act in an excited manner like a prophet, to rave*. The meaning of *Hithpa'el* sometimes coincides with that of *Qal*, both forms being in use together, e. g. אָבַל *to mourn*, in *Qal* only in poetic style, in *Hithpa'el* in prose. On the accusative after *Hithpa'el* (regarded as a transitive verb), see § 117 w.

f (b) It expresses *reciprocal* action, like *Niph'al*, § 51 d, e. g. הִתְרָאָה *to look upon one another*, Gn 42¹; cf. ψ 41⁸;—but

(c) It more often indicates an action less directly affecting the subject, and describes it as performed *with regard to or for oneself*, in one's own special interest (cf. *Niph'al*, § 51 e). *Hithpa'el* in such cases readily takes an accusative, e. g. הִתְפָּרַק Ex 32³ and הִתְנַצַּל Ex 33⁶ *to tear off from oneself*; הִתְפַּשֵּׁט *exuit sibi (vestem)*, הִתְפַּתַּח *solvit sibi (vincula)*; הִצְמִיךְ Jos 9¹², *to take (something) as one's provision*; without an accusative, הִתְהַלֵּךְ *to walk about for oneself (ambulare)*; הִתְפַּלֵּל *sibi intercedere* (see Delitzsch on Is 1¹⁵); הִתְחַקֶּה *to draw a line for oneself*, Job 13²⁷; on Is 14², see § 57, note.

g (d) Only seldom is it *passive*, e. g. הָיָה תְהַלָּל Pr 31³⁰ *she shall be praised*; הִשְׁתַּכַּח *to be forgotten*, Ec 8¹⁰, where the reflexive sense (*to bring oneself into oblivion*) has altogether disappeared. Cf. *Niph'al*, § 51 f.

h The passive form *Hothpa'al* is found only in the few following examples: הִפְּחוּ *to be defiled*, Dt 24⁴; infinitive הִכְבִּים *to be washed*, Lv 13^{55,56}; הִרְשְׁנָה (for הִתְרַשְׁנָה, the נָה being treated as if it were the affirmative of the fem. plur.) *it is made fat*, Is 34⁶. On הִתְפַּקְדוּ, see l.

i Denominatives with a reflexive meaning are הִתְיַהַד *to embrace Judaism*, from יְהוּדָה (יְהוּדָה) *Judah*; הִצְמִיךְ *to provision oneself for a journey*, from צִידָה *provision for a journey* (see § 72 m).

k Rem. 1. As in *Pi'el*, so in *Hithpa'el*, the perfect very frequently (in stems ending in ל, ק, מ, פ) has retained the original *Pathah* in the final syllable (while in the ordinary form it is attenuated, as in *Pi'el*, to *i* and then lengthened to *ē*), e. g. הִתְאַנַּף Dt 4²¹, &c.; cf. 2 Ch 13⁷, 15⁸; with *consecutive* Is 8²¹; so also in the imperfect and imperative, e. g. הִתְחַכֵּם Ec 7¹⁶; cf. Dt 9^{8,18}, I S 3¹⁰, 2 S 10¹², I K 11⁹, Is 55², 58¹⁴, 64¹¹, ψ 55²; הִתְחַנֵּן I K 20²², ψ 37⁴, Est 5¹⁰; וְהִתְאַפֵּק I S 13¹².—In Lv 11⁴⁴, 20⁷ and Ez 38²³, *i* takes the place of *ā* in the first syllable of the stem before שׁ (cf. § 44 d), and in the last passage before ל. In the perfect, imperfect (with the exception of Ec 7¹⁶), and imperative of *Hithpa'el* (as well as of *Hithpa'el*, *Hithpa'el*, *Hithpa'el*, § 55) the original *ā* always returns in pause as *Qamez*, e. g. הִתְאַוֵּךְ ψ 93¹; הִתְאַבֵּל Ez 7²⁷; יִתְחַלֵּךְ Jb 18⁸; יִתְחַלְּכֻךְ 38³⁰; הִתְחַקֵּשׁ Jos 3⁵; cf. Jb 33⁵ and § 74 b.—The *ā* also appears before the fuller ending ך in the plural of the imperfect (cf. § 47 m) in ψ 12⁹, Jb

9⁶, 16¹⁰.—Like the *Pi'el* הִתְקַלֵּן (§ 52 n), forms occur in *Hithpa'el* like הִתְקַלֵּן Ze 6⁷; cf. Am 8¹³, and so in *Hithpo'el*, Jer 49³, Am 9¹³; with *ē* only in La 4¹.—In the Aramaic manner an *infinitive Hithpa'el* הִתְחַבְּרִית occurs in Dn 11²³ (cf. the *Hiph'il* inf. הִשְׁמַעוּת in Ez 24²⁶).

2. As instances of the *reflexive* הִתְקַלֵּן (connected with *Pi'el*) a few reflexive *l* forms of the verb פָּקַד (*to examine*) are also probably to be reckoned. Instead of a *Pathah* in a sharpened syllable after the first radical, these take *Qames* in an open syllable, e. g. הִתְפַּקְּדוּ Ju 20^{15,17}, *imperfect* יִתְפַּקְּדוּ 20¹⁵, 21⁹. The corresponding passive form הִתְפַּקְּדוּ also occurs four times, Nu 1⁴⁷, 2³³, 26⁶², 1 K 20²⁷. According to others, these forms are rather reflexives of *Qal*, in the sense of *to present oneself for review, to be reviewed*, like the Aramaic 'Ithpe'el (Western Aramaic אֲתַקְטִיל, Syr. אֲתַקְטִיל) and the Ethiopic *tagat'ela*, Arab. 'iqtat'ala, the last with the *t* always placed after the first radical (cf. above, b); but they are more correctly explained, with König, as *Hithpa'el* forms, the doubling of the *p* being abnormally omitted.—Such a reflexive of *Qal*, with the *n* transposed, occurs in הִלַחֲחִי (on the analogy of O. T. Hebrew to be pronounced הִלַחֲחִי) in the inscription of the Moabite king Mēša', with the meaning of the O. T. נִלַחֲחִי *to fight, to wage war*: see the inscription, lines 11, 15, 19, and 32; in the first two places in the *imperfect* with *wāw* consecutive וְנִלַחֲחִי; in line 19 in the *infinitive* with suffix, בְּהִלַחֲחִי in his fighting against me.

§ 55. Less Common Conjugations.

Of the less common conjugations (§ 39 g) some may be classed with *a* *Pi'el*, others with *Hiph'il*. To the former belong those which arise from the lengthening of the vowel or the repetition of one or even two radicals, in fact, from an internal modification or development of the stem; to the latter belong those which are formed by prefixing a consonant, like the *h* of *Hiph'il*. Amongst the conjugations analogous to *Pi'el* are included the *passive* forms distinguished by their vowels, as well as the reflexives with the prefix הִתְ, on the analogy of *Hithpa'el*.

The following conjugations are related to *Pi'el*, as regards their *b* inflexion and partly in their meaning:

1. *Pi'el* קוּטַל, passive *Po'al* קוּטַל, reflexive *Hithpo'el* הִתְקוּטַל, corresponding to the Arabic conj. III. *qātālā*, pass. *qūtālā*, and conj. VI. reflexive *tāqātālā*; *imperfect* יִקוּטַל, *participle* מְקוּטַל, *imperfect passive* יִקוּטַל &c. Hence it appears that in Hebrew the *ō* of the first syllable is in all the forms obscured from *ā*, while the passive form is distinguished simply by the *a*-sound in the second syllable. In the strong verb these conjugations are rather rare. Examples: *participle* מְשַׁפְּטִי mine adversary, who would contend with me, Jb 9¹⁵; מְלֹשְׁנִי (denominative from לָשׁוֹן the tongue) slandering (as if intent on injuring with the tongue) ψ 101⁵ *Keth.* (The *Qerē* requires מְלֹשְׁנִי *mēlōšnā* as Na 1³ וְגִדְּלוּ-; זָרְמוּ they have poured out, ψ 77¹⁸ (if not rather *Pu'al*); יוֹדְעָתִי I have appointed, 1 S 21³ (unless הוֹדְעָתִי should be read); יִסְעֶר Ho 13³; שִׁיֵּשׁ to take root, passive

שׁוּרֶשׁ, denominative from שָׁרַשׁ root (but שָׁרַשׁ to root out); in Hithpô'el שִׁוּרְשׁוּ they shall be moved, Jer 25¹⁶; imperf. 46⁸; from a verb שׁוּרְשִׁי Is 10¹³. The participle מְשׁוּרֵשׁ Is 52⁵ is probably a *forma mixta* combining the readings מְשׁוּרֵשׁ and מְשׁוּרֵשׁ.

- c Po'el proper (as distinguished from the corresponding conjugations of verbs ע"ע § 67 l and ע"ע § 72 m, which take the place of the ordinary causative Pi'el) expresses an aim or endeavour to perform the action, especially with hostile intent, and is hence called, by Ewald, the stem expressing aim (Ziel-stamm), endeavour (Suche-stamm) or attack (Angriffs-stamm); cf. the examples given above from Jb 9¹⁵, ψ 101⁵, and עֵינַי 1 S 18⁹ Q^{eré} (probably for מְעֵינַי, cf. § 52 s; § 55 f: seeking to cast an evil eye).

With קִטֵּל is connected the formation of quadrilaterals by the insertion of a consonant between the first and second radicals (§ 30 p, § 56).

- d 2. Pa'el, generally with the ā attenuated to ǐ = Pi'el¹ (Pi'el), קָטַל and קָטַל; the ē in the final syllable also arises from ǐ, and this again from ā; passive Pu'al קִטְּלוּ, reflexive Hithpa'el הִתְקַטְּלוּ, like the Arabic conjugations ix. 'iqṭallā and xi. 'iqṭallā, the former used of permanent, the latter of accidental or changing conditions, e.g. of colours; cf. שָׁאֵן to be at rest, רֶעֵן to be green, passive אִמָּל to be withered, all of them found only in the perfect and with no corresponding Qal form. (For the barbarous form צִמְחָתַי ψ 88¹⁷ read צִמְחָתַי; for נָפַל Ez 28²⁸, which has manifestly arisen only from confusion with the following חָלַל, read נָפַל). These forms are more common in verbs ע"ע, where they take the place of Pi'el and Hithpa'el (§ 72 m). Cf. also § 75 kk.

- e 3. Pe'al'al: קָטַטְּלוּ with repetition of the last two radicals, used of movements repeated in quick succession; e.g. סִחָּחַר to go about quickly, to palpitate (of the heart) ψ 38¹¹, from סָחַר to go about; passive הִמְרַמֵּר to be in a ferment, to be heated, to be red, Jb 16¹⁶, La 1²⁰, 2¹¹. Probably this is also the explanation of הַצֹּצֵר (denom. from הִצְוֹצֵר a trumpet, but only in the participle, 1 Ch 15²⁴ &c. K^{eth.}) for הִצְצֵר, by absorption of the first ר, lengthening of ā in the open syllable, and subsequent obscuring of ā to ô. On the other hand, for the meaningless הָבֵי אֶהְבֵּי Ho 4¹⁸ (which could only be referred to this conjugation if it stood for הָבֵי אֶהְבֵּי) read אֶהְבֵּי, and for the equally meaningless יִפְיֵי ψ 45³ read יִפְיֵי. In both these cases a scribal error (dittography) has been perpetuated by the punctuation, which did not venture to alter the K^{ethibh}. On the employment of Pe'al'al in the formation of nouns, cf. § 84^b n. Closely related to this form is—

- f 4. Pūpēl (pass. Pōlpal), with a strengthening of the two essential radicals in stems ע"ע, ע"ע, and ע"ע, e.g. גָּלַל to roll, from גָּל = גָּל; reflexive הִתְגָּלַל to roll oneself down; בָּלַל from בָּל, passive בִּלְּבַל; cf. also טָאָט (so Baer and Ginsb. after Qimḥi; others טָאָט) Is 14²³, and with ā in both syllables owing to the influence of ר, קָרַר from קָר, Nu 24¹⁷ (cf. however, in the parallel passage, Jer 46⁴⁵ קָרַר) and Is 22⁶, in the participle; שָׁשָׁן Is 17¹¹ to hedge in, acc. to others make to grow. Probably to this form also belongs יִלְעָע, the emended reading of Jb 39³⁰ instead of the impossible יִלְעָע; also

¹ Cf. Wolfensohn, 'The Pi'el in Hebrew,' Amer. Journ. of Or. Studies, xxvii (1907), p. 303 ff.

פִּאפֶּאָה Is 27⁸, if that form is to be referred to an *infinitive* פִּאפֶּאָה; perhaps also נִשְׁנֵא Ez 39² for נִשְׁאֵא. This form also commonly expresses rapidly repeated movement, which all languages incline to indicate by a repetition of the sound,¹ e.g. צִפְצָף to chirp; cf. in the Lexicon the nouns derived from נָרַר, עוּף, and צָלַל.

As *Hithpa'el* we find יִשְׁתַּקְשְׁקוּ Na 2⁶; וַיִּתְחַלְחַל Est 4¹; וַיִּתְמַרְמַר Dn 8⁷, g 11¹¹. Of the same form is אֶדְדָּה Is 38¹⁵, if contracted from אֶתְדַּדְּהָ or אֶתְדִּירָה from the root דִּי or דִּי, and also הִתְמַהְמַה tarry ye, Is 29⁹ (but read probably הִתְמַהְמַה), וַיִּתְמַהְמַה (in pause) Gn 19¹⁶, &c., if it is to be derived from מַהַה, and not *Hithpa'el* from מַהְמַה.

Only examples more or less doubtful can be adduced of—

5. *Tiph'el* (properly *Taph'el*²): תִּקְטֵל, with ת prefixed, cf. תִּלְלֵנִי to teach to walk, to lead (denominative from לָלַל a foot?) Ho 11³; from a stem ל"ה, the imperfect יִתְחַרָּה to contend with, Jer 12⁵; participle, 22¹⁵ (from חָרָה to be hot, eager). Similarly in Aramaic, תִּרְגֵּם to interpret, whence also in Hebrew the passive participle מְתַרְגֵּם Ezr 4⁷.

6. *Saph'el*: שִׁקְטֵל, frequent in Syriac, e.g. שִׁלְהַב from לָהַב to flame; whence i in Hebrew שִׁלְהֶבֶת flame. Perhaps of the same form is שִׁבְלוֹל a snail (unless it be from the stem שָׁבַל), and שִׁקְעָרוֹת hollow strakes, cf. § 85, No. 50. This conjugation is perhaps the original of *Hiph'il*, in which case the ה, by a phonetic change which may be exemplified elsewhere, is weakened from a sibilant.

* * *

Forms of which only isolated examples occur are:—

7. קִטְלַט, passive קִטְלַט; as מִחִסְפָּס peeled off, like scales, Ex 16¹⁴, from חָסַף, חִשָּׁף to peel, to scale.

8. קִטְקֵל, in יוֹרֵיף a rain-storm, from יָרַף.

9. נִתְקַטֵּל (regularly in Mishnic Hebrew³) a form compounded of *Niph'al* and *Hithpa'el*; as וְנִתְקַטְּרוּ וְנִתְקַטְּרוּ that they may be taught, Ez 23⁴⁸; נִבְפֵּר probably an error for הִתְבַּפֵּר to be forgiven, Dt 21⁸. On נִשְׁתַּחֲוּהוּ Pr 27¹⁵, see § 75 x.

§ 56. Quadriliterals.

On the origin of these altogether secondary formations cf. § 30 p. While quadriliteral nouns are tolerably numerous, only the following examples of the verb occur:

¹ Cf. Lat. *tinnio*, *tintinno*, our *tick-tack*, *ding-dong*, and the German *wirrwarr*, *klingsklang*. The repetition of the radical in verbs טָטַט also produces this effect; as in לָקַק to lick, דָּקַק to pound, טָפַף to trip along. The same thing is expressed also by *diminutive* forms, as in Latin by the termination *-illo*, e.g. *cantillo*, in German by *-eln*, *-ern*, e.g. *flimmern*, *trillern*, *tröpfeln*, to trickle.

² The existence of a *Taph'el* is contested on good grounds by Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 279.

³ [See Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, Oxf. 1909, p. 30 ff.]

(a) On the analogy of *Pi'el*: **יִכְרַסְמֶנָּה**, *imperfect* **יִכְרַסְמֶנָּה** *he doth ravage it*, *ψ* 80¹⁴ from **כָּרַס**, cf. **נָוֶם**. *Passive* **רָתַפֵּשׁ** *to grow fresh again*, *Jb* 33²⁶. *Participle* **מְכַרְבֵּל** *girt, clothed* (cf. Aramaic **כָּבַל** *to bind*), *1 Ch* 15²⁷. It is usual also to include among the quadrilaterals **פָּרִישׁוּ** *Jb* 26⁹, as a *perfect* of Aramaic form with *Pathah* not attenuated. It is more correctly, however, regarded, with Delitzsch, as the *infinitive absolute* of a *Pi'el* formation, from **פָּרַשׁ** *to spread out*, with euphonic change of the first **שׁ** to **שׁ**, and the second to **י**. Moreover, the reading **פָּרִישׁוּ** also is very well attested, and is adopted by Baer in the text of *Job*; cf. the Rem. on p. 48 of his edition.

(b) On the analogy of *Hiph'il*: **הִשְׁמָאִיל**, by syncope **הִשְׁמָאִיל** and **הִשְׁמִיל** *to turn to the left* (denom. from **שָׂמַל**) *Gn* 13⁹, *Is* 30²¹, &c. On **הִאֲוִיחוּ** cf. § 53 p.

C. STRONG VERB WITH PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES.¹

§ 57.

The accusative of the personal pronoun, depending on an active verb,² may be expressed (1) by a separate word, **אֵת** the accusative sign (before a suffix **אֵת**, **אֵת**) with the pronominal suffix, e. g. **קָטַל אֹתוֹ** *he has killed him*; or (2) by a mere suffix, **קָטַלְהוּ** or **קָטְלוּ** *he has killed him*. The latter is the usual method (§ 33), and we are here concerned with it alone.³ Neither of these methods, however, is employed when the accusative of the pronoun is *reflexive*. In that case a reflexive verb is used, viz. *Niph'al* or *Hithpa'el* (§§ 51 and 54), e. g. **הִתְקַדֵּשׁ** *he sanctified himself*, not **קִדְּשׁוּ**, which could only mean *he sanctified him*.⁴

Two points must be specially considered here: the form of the suffix itself (§ 58), and the form which the verb takes when suffixes are added to it (§§ 59–61).

¹ This subject of the verbal suffixes is treated here in connexion with the strong verb, in order that both the forms of the suffixes and the general laws which regulate their union with verbal forms may be clearly seen. The rules which relate to the union of the suffixes with weak verbs will be given under the several classes of those verbs.

² An accusative suffix occurs with *Niph'al* in *ψ* 109³ (since **נִלְחָם** is used in the sense of *to attack*), and according to some, in *Is* 44²¹; with *Hithpa'el* *Is* 14² (**הִתְנַחֵל** *to appropriate somebody to oneself as a possession*); cf. above, § 54 f, and § 117 w.

³ On the cases where **אֵת** is necessary, see § 117 e.

⁴ The exceptions in *Jer* 7¹⁹, *Ez* 34^{2,8,10} are only apparent. In all these instances the sharp antithesis between **אֵתָם** (*themselves*) and another object could only be expressed by retaining the same verb; also in *Ex* 5¹⁹ **אֵתָם** after an active verb serves to emphasize the idea of *themselves*.

§ 58. *The Pronominal Suffixes of the Verb.*

Cf. the statistics collected by H. Petri, *Das Verbum mit Suffixen im Hebr.*, part ii, in the נביאים ראשונים, Leipzig, 1890. W. Diehl, *Das Pronomen pers. suff. . . . des Hebr.*, Giessen, 1895. J. Barth, 'Beiträge zur Suffixlehre des Nordsem.', *AJSL*. xvii (1901), p. 205 f. Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, i. 159 f.; *Grundriss*, p. 638 ff.

1. The *pronominal suffixes* appended to the verb express the *a* accusative of the *personal pronoun*. They are the following:—

A.	B.	C.
<i>To a form ending in a Vowel.</i>	<i>To a form in the Perf. ending in a Consonant.</i>	<i>To a form in the Imperf. ending in a Consonant.</i>
Sing. 1. com. נִי	נִי (in pause נִי־)	נִי me.
2. m. ךִּי	ךִּי (in pause ךִּי־, also ךִּי־)	ךִּי thee.
f. ךִּי	ךִּי־ ךִּי־, rarely ךִּי־	ךִּי
3. m. הוֹי, י	הוֹי, י (הוֹי)	הוֹי him.
f. הִי	הִי	הִי her.
Plur. 1. com. נוֹי	נוֹי	נוֹי us.
2. m. כִּם	כִּם	כִּם you (vos).
f. ¹		
3. m. הֵם, ךִּם	הֵם (from הֵם־), ךִּם	הֵם (from הֵם־) eos.
poet. מוֹי	מוֹי	מוֹי
f. יִי	יִי, יִי־ ¹ eas.

2. That these suffixes are connected with the corresponding *forms b* of the *personal pronoun* (§ 32) is for the most part self-evident, and only a few of them require elucidation.

The suffixes נִי, נִי, הוֹי, ךִּי (and ךִּי, when a long vowel in an open syllable precedes) never have the tone, which always rests on the preceding syllable; on the other hand, כִּם and הֵם always take the tone.

In the 3rd pers. masc. הוֹי־, by contraction of *a* and *u* after the *d* rejection of the weak ה, frequently gives rise to *ô* (§ 23 *k*), ordinarily written *i*, much less frequently *î* (see § 7 *c*). In the *feminine*, the suffix ךִּי should be pronounced with a preceding *a* (cf. below, *f*, note), as ךִּי־ or ךִּי־, on the analogy of *āhā*; instead of ךִּי־, however, it was simply pronounced ךִּי־, with the rejection of the final vowel,

¹ According to Diehl (see above), p. 61, כִּם occurs only once with the perfect (see § 59 *e*), 7 times with the imperfect, but never in pre-exilic passages, whereas the accus. כִּם־ occurs 40 times in Jer. and 36 times in Ezek.—הֵם occurs only once as a verbal suffix (Dt 32²⁶, unless, with Kahan, *Infinitive u. Participien*, p. 13, הֵם־ from הֵם־ is to be read), while the forms כִּי (2nd *f. pl.*) and יִי and יִי־ (3rd *f. pl.*), added by Qimḥi, never occur.

and with *Mappiq*, since the ה is consonantal; but the weakening to הֿ is also found, see below, *g*.

c 3. The *variety* of the suffix-forms is occasioned chiefly by the fact that they are modified differently according to the form and tense of the verb to which they are attached. For almost every suffix three forms may be distinguished:

(a) One beginning with a consonant, as נִי־, הִי־, ו (only after *i*), נִי־, (הִי־) ׀, &c. These are attached to verbal forms which end with a vowel, e.g. יִקְטְלוּנִי; קְטַלְתִּיהוּ, for which by absorption of the ה we also get קְטַלְתִּי, pronounced *qēṭaltîu*; cf. § 8 *m*.

f (b) A second and third with what are called *connecting vowels*¹ (נִי־, נִי־), used with verbal forms ending with a consonant (for exceptions, see § 59 *g* and § 60 *e*). This *connecting vowel* is *a* with the forms of the perfect, e.g. קְטַלְנִי, קְטַלְתִּי, קְטַלְתֶּם (on קְטַלְתֶּם, the ordinary form of the 3rd masc. perf. with the 2nd fem. suffix, cf. below, *g*); and *e* (less frequently *a*) with the forms of the imperfect and imperative, e.g. יִקְטַלְהוּ, קְטַלְתֶּם; also with the infinitive and participles, when these do not take noun-suffixes (cf. § 61 *a* and *h*). The form *i* also belongs to the suffixes of the perfect, since it has arisen from הִי־ (cf., however, § 60 *d*). With הֿ, בִּם, the connecting sound is only a vocal *Ṣewā*, which has arisen from an original short vowel, thus הֿ־, בִּם־, e.g. קְטַלְתֶּם (qēṭāl^ekhā), or when the final consonant of the verb is a guttural, הֿ־, e.g. קְטַלְתֶּם. In *pause*, the original short vowel (*ā*) reappears as *Seghôl* with the tone הֿ־ (also הֿ־, see *g*). On the appending of suffixes to the final ׀ of the imperfect (§ 47 *m*), see § 60 *e*.

g Rem. 1. As rare forms may be mentioned *sing.* 2nd pers. masc. בָּךְ Gn 27⁷, 1 K 18⁴⁴, &c., in *pause* also בָּךְ־ (see below, *i*); *fem.* בִּי, בִּי־ ψ 103⁴, 137⁶. Instead of the form בִּי־, which is usual even in the perfect (e.g. Ju 4²⁰, Ez 27²⁶), בִּי־ occurs as *fem.* Is 60⁹ (as *masc.* Dt 6¹⁷, 28⁴⁵, Is 30¹⁹, 55⁵ always in *pause*); with *Munah* Is 54⁶, Jer 23³⁷.—In the 3rd masc. הִי Ex 32²⁵, Nu 23⁸; in the 3rd fem. הִי without *Mappiq* (cf. § 91 *e*) Ex 2³, Jer 44¹⁹; Am 1¹¹, with

¹ We have kept the term *connecting vowel*, although it is rather a superficial description, and moreover these vowels are of various origin. The connective *a* is most probably the remains of the old verbal termination, like the *i* in the 2nd pers. *fem.* sing. קְטַלְתִּיהוּ. Observe e.g. the Hebrew form *qēṭāl-ani* in connexion with the Arabic *qatala-ni*, contrasted with Hebrew *qēṭālāt-ni* and Arabic *qatalāt-ni*. König accordingly prefers the expression 'vocalic ending of the stem', instead of 'connecting syllable'. The connective *e*, *ā*, as Prātorius (*ZDMG.* 55, 267 ff.) and Barth (*ibid.* p. 205 f.) show by reference to the Syriac connective *ai* in the imperf. of the strong verb, is originally due to the analogy of verbs מְחַיֵּי (מְחַיֵּי from *mēḥaini*), in which the final *e* was used as a connecting vowel first of the imperat., then of the imperf. (besides many forms with *a*, § 60 *d*), and of the infin. and participle.

retraction of the tone before a following tone-syllable, but read certainly *לְנֶפֶשׁ*.—The forms *מוֹ*—, *מוֹ*—, *מוֹ*— occur 23 times, all in poetry¹ (except Ex 23³¹) [viz. with the perfect Ex 15¹⁰, 23³¹, ψ 73⁶; with the imperfect Ex 15⁶ (*מוֹ* for *מוֹ*), 15^{7,9,9,12,15,17,17}, ψ 2⁵, 21^{10,13}, 22⁶, 45¹⁷, 80⁶, 14¹⁰; with the imperative ψ 51¹, 59^{12,12}, 83¹²]. On the age of these forms, see § 91 l 3; on *יִ*— and *יִ*— as suffixes of the 3rd fem. plur. of the imperfect, § 60 d.—In Gn 48⁹ *קָהָם־נָפֶשׁ* (cf. *וַיָּבֶם־נָפֶשׁ* 1 Ch 14¹¹ according to Baer), *ם*— has lost the tone before *Maggeph* and so is shortened to *ם*—.—In Ez 44⁸ *וְהָשִׁימוֹן* is probably only an error for *וְהָשִׁימוֹן*.

2. From a comparison of these verbal suffixes with the noun-suffixes (§ 91) *h* we find that (a) there is a greater variety of forms amongst the verbal than amongst the noun-suffixes, the forms and relations of the verb itself being more various;—(b) the verbal suffix, where it differs from that of the noun, is longer; cf. e.g. *נִי*—, *נִי*—, *נִי*— (*me*) with *י*— (*my*). The reason is that the pronominal object is less closely connected with the verb than the possessive pronoun (the genitive) is with the noun; consequently the former can also be expressed by a separate word (*את* in *אֶתִּי*, &c.).

4. A verbal form with a suffix gains additional strength, and some-² times intentional emphasis, when, instead of the mere connecting vowel, a special connecting-syllable² (*ān*)³ is inserted between the suffix and the verbal stem. Since, however, this syllable always has the tone, the *ā* is invariably (except in the 1st pers. sing.) modified to tone-bearing *Sēghôl*. This is called the *Nûn energicum*⁴ (less suitably *demonstrativum* or *epentheticum*), and occurs principally (see, however, Dt 32¹⁰ *bis*) in pausal forms of the imperfect, e.g. *יְבָרֵכְנִי* *he will bless him* (ψ 72¹⁵, cf. Jer 5²²), *אֶתְהַלֵּלְנִי* Jer 22²⁴; *יִכְבֶּדְנִי* *he will honour me* (ψ 50²³) is unusual; rarely in the perfect, Dt 24¹³ *יִבְרַכְךָ*. On examples like *נִי*— Gn 30⁶, cf. § 26 g, § 59 f. In far the greatest number of cases, however, this *Nûn* is assimilated to the following consonant (*נ*, *כ*), or the latter is lost in pronunciation (so *ה*), and the *Nûn* consequently sharpened. Hence we get the following series of suffix-forms:—

¹ Thus in ψ 2 *מוֹ*— occurs five times [four times attached to a noun or preposition, §§ 91 f, 103 c], and *ם*— only twice.

² It is, however, a question whether, instead of a connecting syllable, we should not assume a special verbal form, analogous to the Arabic *energetic mood* (see l, at the end) and probably also appearing in the Hebrew cohortative (see the footnote on § 48 c).—As M. Lambert has shown in *REJ.* 1903, p. 178 ff. ('De l'emploi des suffixes pronominaux . . .'), the suffixes of the 3rd pers. with the impf. without *waw* in prose are *נִי*— and *נָה*—, but with *waw* consec. *הִי*— and *נָה*— or *הָ*—; with the jussive in the 2nd and 3rd pers. always *הִי*—, *נָה*—, in the 1st pers. more often *נָה*— than *הִי*—, and always *נָה*—.

³ According to Barth 'n-haltige Suffixe' in *Sprachwiss. Untersuchungen*, Lpz. 1907, p. 1 ff., the connecting element, as in Aramaic, was originally *in*, which in Hebrew became *en* in a closed tone-syllable.

⁴ So König, *Lehrgeb.*, i. p. 226.

1st pers. אָנִי (even in pause, Jb 7¹⁴, &c.), אָנִי (for אָנִי , אָנִי).

2nd pers. אַתָּה (Jer 22²⁴ in pause אַתָּה) and, only orthographically different,

אַתָּה (Is 10²⁴, Pr 2¹¹ in pause).

3rd pers. הוּא (for הוּא),¹ fem. הִיא for הִיא .

[1st pers. plur. אֲנִי (for אֲנִי), see the Rem.]

In the other persons Nûn energetic does not occur.

k Rem. The uncontracted forms with Nûn are rare, and occur only in poetic or elevated style (Ex 15², Dt 32¹⁰ [bis], Jer 5²², 22²⁴); they are never found in the 3rd fem. sing. and 1st plur. On the other hand, the contracted forms are tolerably frequent, even in prose. An example of אֲנִי as 1st plur. occurs perhaps in Jb 31¹⁵ [but read אֲנִי and cf. § 72 cc], hardly in Ho 12⁵; cf. הִנֵּנוּ behold us, Gn 44¹⁶, 50¹⁸, Nu 14⁴⁰ for הִנֵּנוּ (instead of הִנֵּנוּ ; see § 20 m).— In Ez 4¹² the Masora requires הִנֵּנוּ , without Dageš in the Nûn.

l That the forms with Nûn *energeticum* are intended to give greater emphasis to the verbal form is seen from their special frequency in pause. Apart from the verb, however, Nûn *energeticum* occurs also in the union of suffixes with certain particles (§ 100 o).

This Nûn is frequent in Western Aramaic. In Arabic the corresponding forms are the two *energetic moods* (see § 48 b) ending in *an* and *anna*, which are used in connexion with suffixes (e.g. *yaqtulan-ka* or *yaqtulanna-ka*) as well as without them.

§ 59. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes.

a 1. The endings (*affirmatives*) of the perfect occasionally vary somewhat from the ordinary form, when connected with pronominal suffixes; viz.:—

(a) In the 3rd sing. fem. the original feminine ending תָּ or תָּ is used for תָּ .

(b) In the 2nd sing. masc. besides תָּ we find תָּ , to which the connecting vowel is directly attached, but the only clear instances of this are with אָנִי .²

(c) In the 2nd sing. fem. תָּי , the original form of תָּ , appears; cf. תָּי , תָּי , § 32 f; § 44 g. This form can be distinguished from the 1st pers. only by the context.

(d) 2nd plur. masc. תָּי for תָּי . The only examples are Nu 20⁵, 21⁵, Zc 7⁵. The fem. תָּי never occurs with suffixes; probably it had the same form as the masculine.

b We exhibit first the forms of the perfect *Hiph'il*, as used in connexion with suffixes, since here no further changes take place in the stem itself, except as regards the tone (see c).

¹ On $\text{אָנִי} = \text{אָנִי}$ Nu 23¹³, see § 67 o.

² On the *ā* as an original element of the verbal form, see § 58 f, note.

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3. <i>m.</i> הקטיל	3. <i>c.</i> הקטילו
3. <i>f.</i> הקטילת	
2. <i>m.</i> הקטילת, הקטלת	2. <i>m.</i> הקטלתו
2. <i>f.</i> הקטילתי, הקטלתי	
1. <i>c.</i> הקטילתי	1. <i>c.</i> הקטלנו

The beginner should first practise connecting the suffixes with these *Hiph'il* forms and then go on to unite them to the *Perfect Qal* (see *d*).

2. The addition of the suffix generally causes the tone to be thrown *c* forward towards the end of the word, since it would otherwise fall, in some cases, on the ante-penultima; with the *heavy* suffixes (see *e*) the tone is even transferred to the suffix itself. Considerations of tone, especially in the *Perfect Qal*, occasion certain vowel changes: (*a*) the *Qames* of the first syllable, no longer standing *before* the tone, always becomes vocal *Šewā*; (*b*) the original *Pathah* of the second syllable, which in the 3rd *sing. fem.* and 3rd *plur.* had become *Šewā*, reappears before the suffix, and, in an open syllable before the tone, is lengthened to *Qames*; similarly original *i* (as in the 3rd *sing. masc.* without a suffix) is lengthened to *ē*, e. g. אֶתְּבִידָּהּ 1 S 18²², Pr 19⁷.

The forms of the perfect of *Qal* consequently appear as follows:— *d*

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3. <i>m.</i> קטל	3. <i>c.</i> קטלו
3. <i>f.</i> קטלת (קטלת, see <i>g</i>)	
2. <i>m.</i> קטלת (קטלת, see <i>h</i>)	2. <i>m.</i> קטלתו
2. <i>f.</i> קטלתי (קטלת, see <i>h</i>)	
1. <i>c.</i> קטלתי	1. <i>c.</i> קטלנו

The connexion of these forms with all the suffixes is shown in *Paradigm C*. It will be seen there also, how the *Sere* in the *Perfect Pi'el* changes sometimes into *Seghôl*, and sometimes into vocal *Šewā*.

Rem. 1. The suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd pers. plur. כֶּם and הֶם, since they *c* end in a consonant and also always have the tone, are distinguished as *heavy* suffixes (*suffixa gravia*) from the rest, which are called *light* suffixes. Compare the connexion of these (and of the corresponding feminine forms כֵּן and הֵן) with the *noun*, § 91. With a perfect כֶּם alone occurs, ψ 118²⁰. The form קטל which is usually given as the connective form of the 3rd *sing. masc.* before כֶּם and כֵּן is only formed by analogy, and is without example in the O. T.

2. In the 3rd *sing. masc.* קטל (especially in verbs ל"ה; in the strong verb only in Jer 20¹⁵ in *Pi'el*) is mostly contracted to קטל, according to § 23 *k*; likewise in the 2nd *sing. masc.* קטלתו to קטלתו.—As a suffix of the 1st *sing.* נִי occurs several times with the 3rd *sing. masc. perf. Qal* of verbs ל"ה, not only in *pause* (as עָנִי ψ 118⁵; קָנִי Pr 8²² with *D^ehi*), but even with a con-

conjunctive accent, as אֶנֶנִּי Jb 30¹⁹; עָנִנִּי 1 S 28¹⁵ (where, however, the reading עָנִי is also found). With a sharpened נִנִּי Gn 30⁶, יִסְרִנִּי ψ 118¹⁸.

g 3. The 3rd sing. fem. קָטְלָה (= קָטְלָה) has the twofold peculiarity that (a) the ending *ath* always takes the tone,¹ and consequently is joined to those suffixes which form a syllable of themselves (נִי, הִי, הָ, נוֹ), without a connecting vowel, contrary to the general rule, § 58 f; (b) before the other suffixes the connecting vowel is indeed employed, but the tone is drawn back to the penultima, so that they are pronounced with shortened vowels, viz. הָ—, מ—, e.g. אֶהֱבָתְךָ she loves thee, Ru 4¹⁵, cf. Is 47¹⁰; וְנָבְזָתָם she has stolen them, Gn 31³²; שִׁרְפָתָם it burns them, Is 47¹⁴, Jos 2⁶, Ho 2¹⁴, ψ 48⁷. For תָּנִי, תָּךְ &c., in pause תָּנִי is found, Jer 8²¹, ψ 69¹⁰, and תָּךְ Ct 8⁵; and also without the pause for the sake of the assonance תִּפְלָתְךָ, she was in travail with thee, ibid. The form קָטְלָהּ (e.g. Ru 4¹⁵) has arisen, through the loss of the ה and the consequent sharpening of the ת (as in נָנִי and נָהָ for נָהִי and נָהָ, cf. § 58 i), from the form קָטְלָתְהוּ, which is also found even in pause (אֶהֱבָתְהוּ 1 S 18²³; elsewhere it takes in pause the form סִמְכָתְהוּ Is 59¹⁶); so קָטְלָתָהּ from קָטְלָתָהּ; cf. 1 S 1⁶, Is 34¹⁷, Jer 49²⁴, Ru 3⁶; in pause Ez 14¹⁵, always, on the authority of Qimḥi, without Mappiq in the ה, which is consequently always a mere vowel-letter.

h 4. In the 2nd sing. masc. the form קָטַלְתָּ is mostly used, and the suffixes have, therefore, no connecting vowel, e.g. פָּרַצְתָּנוּ וְנָחַתָּנוּ thou hast cast us off, thou hast broken us down, ψ 60³; but with the suff. of the 1st sing. the form קָטַלְתָּנִי is used, e.g. הִקְרַחְתָּנִי ψ 139¹; in pause, however, with Qames, e.g. עֹוִבְתָּנִי ψ 22²; Ju 1¹⁵ (with Zaqeph qaton); but cf. also צִרְפָּתָנִי ψ 17³ with Mer^ekha.—In the 2nd sing. fem. הָיִי is also written defectively, רָמִיתָנִי 1 S 19¹⁷, Ju 11³⁵, Jer 15¹⁰, Ct 4⁹. Occasionally the suffix is appended to the ordinary form הָ, viz. הִשְׁבַּעְתָּנוּ thou (fem.) dost adjure us, Ct 5⁹, Jos 2^{17.20}; cf. Jer 2²⁷, and, quite abnormally, with Sere הוֹרַחְתָּנוּ thou (fem.) didst let us down, Jos 2¹⁸, where הוֹרַחְתָּנוּ would be expected. In Is 8¹¹ יוֹסְרִנִּי is probably intended as an imperfect.

i 5. In verbs middle ē, the ē remains even before suffixes (see above, c), e.g. אֶהֱבָךְ Dt 15¹⁶, אֶהֱבָתְהוּ 1 S 18²³, cf. 18²²; יִרְאוּהוּ Jb 37²⁴. From a verb middle ō there occurs יִכְלִיתִי I have prevailed against him, ψ 13⁵, from יָכַל with ō instead of ō in a syllable which has lost the tone (§ 44 e).

§ 60. Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes.

a In those forms of the imperfect Qal, which have no affirmatives, the vowel ō of the second syllable mostly becomes — (simple Šewā mobile), sometimes —; thus in the principal pause, Nu 35²⁰, Is 27³, 62², Jer 31³³, Ez 35⁶, Ho 10¹⁰; before the principal pause, ψ 119³³; before a secondary pause, Ez 17²³; even before a conjunctive accent, Jos 23⁵. Before הָ—,

¹ תִּפְלָתְךָ Ct 8⁵ is an exception. כָּם would probably even here have the tone (see e); but no example of the kind occurs in the O.T. In Is 51² the imperfect is used instead of the perfect with a suffix.

כָּם, however, it is shortened to *Qames hatuph*, e.g. יִשְׁמְרֶךָ (but in pause יִשְׁמְרֶךָ or יִשְׁמְרֶךָ; with *Nûn energicum*, see § 58 i), יִשְׁמְרֶכֶם, &c. Instead of תִּקְטְלֶנָּה, the form תִּקְטְלוּ¹ is used for the 2nd and 3rd fem. plur. before suffixes in three places: Jer 2¹⁹, Jb 19¹⁵, Ct 1⁶.

Rem. 1. יִחַבְּרֶךָ ψ 94²⁰ is an anomalous form for יִחַבְּרֶךָ (cf. the analogous בּ יִחַבְּרֶךָ § 67 n) and יִפְנֹשֶׁךָ (so Baer; others יִפְנֹשֶׁךָ) Gn 32¹⁸ for יִפְנֹשֶׁךָ. To the same category as יִחַבְּרֶךָ belong also, according to the usual explanation, תַּעֲבֹדֶם (from תַּעֲבֹד), Ex 20⁵, 23²⁴, Dt 5⁹, and נָעַבְ' Dt 13³. As a matter of fact, the explanation of these forms as imperfects of *Qal* appears to be required by the last of these passages; yet why has the retraction of the *ô* taken place only in these examples (beside numerous forms like יַעֲבֹדֵנִי)? Could the Masora in the two Decalogues and in Ex 23²⁴ (on the analogy of which Dt 13³ was then wrongly pointed) have intended an imperfect *Hoph'al* with the suffix, meaning *thou shalt not allow thyself to be brought to worship them*?

Verbs which have *a* in the second syllable of the imperfect, and imperative, *Qal* (to which class especially *verba tertiæ* and *mediæ gutturalis* belong, § 64 and § 65) do not, as a rule, change the *Pathah* of the imperfect (nor of the imperative, see § 61 g) into *Ṣewā* before suffixes; but the *Pathah*, coming to stand in an open syllable before the tone, is lengthened to *Qames*, e.g. יִבְלֹשֶׁנִי Jb 29¹⁴; יִנְאֲלֶהוּ 3⁵; וַיִּשְׁלַחֵם Jos 8³; יִקְרָאָהוּ ψ 145¹⁸; but יִקְרָאוּ Jer 23⁶, is probably a *forma mixta* combining the readings יִקְרָאוּ and יִקְרָאוּ, cf. § 74 e.

2. Not infrequently suffixes with the connecting vowel *a* are also found with the imperfect, e.g. תִּדְבָּרְכֵנִי Gn 19¹⁹, cf. 29³², Ex 33¹⁰, Nu 22³³, 1 K 22⁴ *Qerê*, Is 56⁸, Jb 9¹⁸; also נִי Gn 27^{19,31}, Jb 7¹⁴, 9³⁴, 13²¹ (in principal pause); וַיִּכְרֶה Gn 37³³, cf. 16⁷, 2 S 11²⁷, Is 26⁶, Jb 28²⁷, 1 Ch 20²; יִכְרֶנּוּ Is 63¹⁶ (manifestly owing to the influence of the preceding וַיִּדְעֶנּוּ); יִלְבֹּשֶׁם Ex 29¹⁰, cf. 2¹⁷, Nu 21³⁰, Dt 7¹⁵, ψ 74⁸; even אִמְלֵם 118¹⁰⁻¹²; וַיִּנְשֹׁעַן Ex 2¹⁷, and יַחֲתִין Hb 2¹⁷ (where, however, the ancient versions read יַחֲתִיךָ); even יִרְבֹּה (*ô* from *āhu*) Ho 8³; cf. Ex 22²⁹, Jos 2⁴ (but read וַיַּצְפֵּנִם); 1 S 18¹ *Keth.*, 21¹⁴ (where, however, the text is corrupt); 2 S 14⁶ (where read with the old versions וַיִּי); Jer 2⁶ (see § 74 e), ψ 35⁸, Ec 4¹².—On pausal *Sēghôl* for *Sere* in וַאֲבָרְכֶם Gn 48⁹ and וַתִּלְאֶהוּ (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Ginsb. וַתִּלְאֶהוּ) Ju 16¹⁶, see § 29 q.

3. Suffixes are also appended in twelve passages to the plural forms in וְ, e viz. תִּדְבָּרְאוּנִי will ye break me in pieces? Jb 19²; יִשְׁתְּרוּנֶךָ (here necessarily with a connecting vowel) Is 60^{7,10}; Pr 5²² (i but probably corrupt); elsewhere always without a connecting vowel; יִקְרָאֵנִי with two other examples Pr 1²⁸, 8¹⁷, Ho 5¹⁵; cf. וַיִּנָּה ψ 63⁴, 91¹²; נָהוּ Jer 5²²; וַיִּנָּה Jer 2²⁴, all in principal pause. [See Böttcher, *Lehrb.*, § 1047 f.]

4. In *P'el*, *Pō'el*, and *Pe'el*, the *Sere* of the final syllable, like the *ô* in *Qal*, becomes vocal *Ṣewā*; but before the suffixes ךְ and כֶּם it is shortened to *Sēghôl*, e.g. יִקְבֹּצֶךָ Dt 30⁴, ψ 34¹², Is 51². With a final guttural, however, יִשְׁלַחֵם Gn 32²⁷; also in Pr 4⁸, where with *Qimhî* תִּבְכֶּךָ is to be read, *ê* is

¹ This form is also found as feminine without a suffix, in Jer 49¹¹, Ez 37⁷. In the latter passage וַתִּקְרָבֵנִי is probably to be regarded, with König, as a clumsy correction of the original וַיִּקְרָב, intended to suggest the reading וַתִּקְרָבֵנִי, to agree with the usual gender of עֲצָמוֹת.

retained in the tone-syllable; an analogous case in *Hiph'il* is וַיִּגְדֵּל Dt 32⁷. Less frequently *Sere* is sharpened to *Hireq*, e.g. אֶמְצָחֶם Jb 16⁵, cf. Ex 31¹³, Is 1¹⁶, 52¹²; so in *Po'el*, Is 25¹, ψ 30², 37³⁴, 145¹, and probably also in *Qal* אֶסְפֶּךָ 1 S 15⁶; cf. § 68 h.

g 5. In *Hiph'il* the *i* remains, e.g. תִּלְבִּישֵׁנִי Jb 10¹¹ (after *wāw* consecutive it is often written defectively, e.g. וַיִּלְבֹּשֶׁם Gn 3²¹ and often); but cf. above, f, Dt 32⁷. Forms like תַּעֲשִׁירֶנָּה *thou enrichest it*, ψ 65¹⁰, 1 S 17²⁵, are rare. Cf. § 53 n.

h 6. Instead of the suffix of the 3rd plur. fem. (י), the suffix of the 3rd plur. masc. (ם) is affixed to the affirmative ו, to avoid a confusion with the personal ending ו; cf. וַיִּמְלֵאֻם Gn 26¹⁵ (previously also with a perf. וַיִּמְלֵאוּם); Gn 26¹⁸, 33¹³, Ex 2¹⁷ (where וַיִּוֹשַׁעַן occurs immediately after); 39^{18,20}, 1 S 6¹⁰ (where also וַיִּנְהֵם is for וַיִּנְהֶן, a neglect of gender which can only be explained by § 135 o).—For יִהְרֹגֶנָּה Zc 11⁵ read perhaps יִהְרֹגֶנָּה with M. Lambert.

§ 61. Infinitive, Imperative and Participle with Pronominal Suffixes.

a 1. The *infinitive construct* of an *active verb* may be construed with an accusative, and therefore can also take a *verbal suffix*, i.e. the *accusative* of the personal pronoun. The only undoubted instances of the kind, however, in the O. T. are infinitives with the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing., e.g. לִדְרֹשֵׁנִי *to inquire of me*, Jer 37⁷. As a rule the infinitive (as a *noun*) takes *noun-suffixes* (in the *genitive*, which may be either subjective or objective, cf. § 115 c), e.g. עָבְרִי *my passing by*; מְלִכּוֹ *his reigning*, see § 115 a and e. The infinitive *Qal*, then, usually has the form *qōṭl*, retaining the original short vowel under the first radical (on the probable ground-form *qūṭūl*, see § 46 a). The resulting syllable as a rule allows a following *Begadkephath* to be spirant, e.g. בְּכַתְּבוֹ *in his writing*, Jer 45¹; cf., however, הִפְנִי Gn 19²¹; נִנְפּוֹ (so ed. Mant.; others נִנְפּוֹ) Ex 12²⁷; עָצְבִי 1 Ch 4¹⁰; before הִ— and כֶּם— also the syllable is completely closed, e.g. בָּאֶסְפֶּךָ Ex 23¹⁶, Lv 23³⁸ (but in pause לְהִרְגֶּךָ Gn 27⁴²), unless the vowel be retained in the second syllable; see d. With the form קָטַל generally, compare the closely allied nouns of the form קָטַל (before a suffix קָטַל or קָטַל), § 84^a a; § 93 q.

b Rem. 1. The infin. of verbs which have *ō* in the last syllable of the *imperfect* of *Qal*, sometimes takes the form *qūṭl* before suffixes, e.g. בְּבִנּוֹ Ex 21⁸; מְבָרֵם Am 2⁶ (but מְבָרָה Ex 21⁸); נָפְלוֹ 2 S 1¹⁰ (but נָפְלוֹ 1 S 29⁸); לְשִׁטְנוֹ Zc 3¹, שִׁבְרִי Lv 26²⁶, Ez 30¹⁸ &c. According to Barth (see above, § 47 i with the note) these forms with *i* in the first syllable point to former *i*-imperfects.

c Infinitives of the form קָטַל (§ 45 c) in verbs middle or third guttural (but cf. also שִׁכְבָּה Gn 19^{33,35}—elsewhere שִׁכְבָּךְ and שִׁכְבְּנוֹ) before suffixes sometimes take the form *qatḷ*, as וַעֲפּוֹ Jon 1¹⁵ (and, with the syllable loosely closed,

פָּעֻמוּ Ju 13²⁵), מִחֲאָדָּרָה Ez 25⁶; sometimes *qūl*, with the *a* attenuated to *i*, especially in verbs third guttural; as בָּטַחְתָּ, בָּלַעְתָּ, בָּקַעְתָּ, בָּנִי, בָּרַעְתָּ. — Contrary to § 58 *f* נִי (1 Ch 12¹⁷) and נָנִי (Ex 14¹¹) are sometimes found with the *infinitive* instead of נִי and נָנִי. On רָדוּפִי my following ψ 38²¹ (but *Q're* רָדוּפִי), cf. the analogous examples in § 46 *e*.

2. With the suffixes תָּ and כֶּם, contrary to the analogy of the corresponding nouns, forms occur like אֲכָלְתָּ thy eating, Gn 2¹⁷; אֲכָלְכֶם Gn 3⁵; עֲמַדְתָּ (others עֲמַדְתָּ) Ob 11, i.e. with *ō* shortened in the same way as in the *imperfect*, see § 60. But the analogy of the nouns is followed in such forms as קִצְרַכֶּם your harvesting, Lv 19⁹, 23²² (with retention of the original *ā*), and מִאֲסָכֶם (read *mō'ōs'khēm*) your despising, Is 30¹²; cf. Dt 20²; on בְּמִצְאָכֶם Gn 32²⁰ (for בְּמִצְאָ), see § 74 *h*. — Very unusual are the infinitive suffixes of the 2nd sing. masc. with נ *energicum* (on the analogy of suffixes with the *imperfect*, § 58 *i*), as יִסְרָךְ Dt 4³⁶, cf. 23⁵, Jb 33³², all in principal pause.

Examples of the *infinitive Niph'al* with suffixes are, הִשְׁכַּרְתָּ Ex 14¹⁸; הִשְׁמַרְתָּ Dt 28²⁰ (in pause, הִשְׁמַרְתָּ verse 24); הִשְׁפַּטְתָּ ψ 37³³; הִנְגַּרְתָּ Ez 21²⁹; הִשְׁמַרְתָּ Dt 7²³. In the *infinitive* of *Pi'el* (as also in the *imperfect*, see § 60 *f*) the *ē* before the suff. תָּ, כֶּם, becomes *S'ghōl*, e.g. דִּבַּרְתָּ Ex 4¹⁰, and with a sharpening to *i* פָּרַשְׁתָּ Is 1¹⁵ (see § 60 *f*). In the *infinitive Pō'el*, בּוֹשְׁשָׁכֶם occurs (with *a* for *ē* or *i*) Am 5¹¹, but probably בּוֹשְׁכֶם, with Wellhausen, is the right reading; the correction *o* has crept into the text alongside of the *corrigendum* *u*.

2. The leading form of the *imperative Qal* before suffixes (קָטַלְתָּ) is *f* due probably (see § 46 *d*) to the retention of the original short vowel of the first syllable (ground-form *qūṭūl*). In the *imperative* also *ō* is not followed by *Dageš lene*, e.g. כֹּתְבֶכֶם kōṭhblhēm (not kōṭhbēm), &c.¹ As in the *imperfect* (§ 60 *d*) and *infinitive* (see above, *c*), so also in the *imperative*, suffixes are found united to the stem by an *a*-sound; e.g. כָּתַבְתָּ Is 30⁸; cf. 2 S 12²⁸. — The forms קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ, which are not exhibited in Paradigm C, undergo no change. Instead of קָטַלְתָּ, the masc. form (קָטַלְתָּ) is used, as in the *imperfect*.

In verbs which form the *imperative* with *a*, like שָׁלַח (to which class *g* belong especially verbs *middle* and *third guttural*, §§ 64 and 65), this *a* retains its place when pronominal suffixes are added, but, since it then stands in an open syllable, is, as a matter of course, lengthened to *Qameṣ* (just as in *imperfects Qal* in *a*, § 60 *c*), e.g. שְׁלַחֲנִי send me, Is 6⁸, בְּחַנֵּי ψ 26², קָרָאֲנִי ψ 50¹⁵, שְׁמַעֲנִי Gn 23⁸. In Am 9¹, בְּצַעַם (so ed. Mant., Baer, Ginsb., instead of the ordinary reading בְּצַעַם) is to be explained, with Margolis, *AJSL*. xix, p. 45 ff., from an original בְּצַעֲמוּ, as וְהִרְגֶנְהֶם Am 9⁴ from original וְהִרְגֶנְתֶּמוּ. — In the *imperative Hiph'il*, the form used in conjunction with suffixes is not the 2nd sing. masc.

¹ שְׁמַרְנִי *šam'renī* required by the Masora in ψ 16¹ (also שְׁמַרְתָּ ψ 86², 119¹⁶⁷; cf. Is 38¹⁴ and עֲמַדְתָּ Ob 11), belongs to the disputed cases discussed in § 59 *c* and § 48 *i* note.

הַקָּטִיל, but הַקָּטִיל (with *i* on account of the open syllable, cf. § 60 g), e. g. הַקָּרִיבָהוּ *present it*, Mal 1⁸.

h 3. Like the infinitives, the participles can also be united with either verbal or noun-suffixes; see § 116 *f*. In both cases the vowel of the participles is shortened or becomes *Šwā* before the suffix, as in the corresponding noun-forms, e. g. from the form קָטִיל: קָטִילוּ, &c.; but before *Šwā mobile* יִצְרָךְ, &c., or with the original *i*, אֵיבָךְ Ex 23⁴, &c., אִסְפָּךְ 2 K 22²⁰ (coinciding in form with the 1st sing. imperfect *Qal*, 1 S 15⁶; cf. § 68 *h*); with a middle guttural (בִּצְאָלְךָ, בִּצְאָלִי); with a third guttural, בִּרְאָךְ Is 43¹, but שִׁלְחָךְ, מִשְׁלַחְךָ Jer 28¹⁶, cf. § 65 *d*. The form מִקְטִיל, with suffix מִקְטִילִי; before *Šwā* sometimes like מִלְמִדְךָ Is 48¹⁷, מִנְחָמְךָ 51¹², sometimes like מִאֲסַפְּךָ 52¹². In Is 47¹⁰ רָאִנִי is irregular for רָאִנִי; instead of the meaningless מְלַלְלִנִי Jer 15¹⁰ read בְּלֹהֶם קָלְלִנִי.

Also unusual (see above, *d*) with participles are the suffixes of the 2nd sing. masc. with *נ* *energicum*, as עֹנֶכְךָ Jb 5¹; cf. Dt 8⁵, 12^{14, 28}.

§ 62. Verbs with Gutturals.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 584 ff.

Verbs which have a guttural for one of the three radicals differ in their inflexion from the ordinary strong verb, according to the general rules in § 22. These differences do not affect the consonantal part of the stem, and it is, therefore, more correct to regard the guttural verbs as a subdivision of the strong verb. At the most, only the entire omission of the strengthening in some of the verbs *middle guttural* (as well as in the *imperfect Niph'al* of verbs *first guttural*) can be regarded as a real weakness (§§ 63 *h*, 64 *e*). On the other hand, some original elements have been preserved in guttural stems, which have degenerated in the ordinary strong verb; e. g. the *ā* of the initial syllable in the *imperfect Qal*, as in יִחְמֹד, which elsewhere is attenuated to *i*, יִקְטֹל.—In guttural verbs *א* and *ה* are only taken into consideration when they are actual consonants, and not vowel-letters like the *א* in some verbs פֹּ"א (§ 68), in a few עֹ"א (§ 73 *g*), and in most לֹ"א (§ 74). In all these cases, however, the *א* was at least originally a full consonant, while the *ה* in verbs לֹ"ה was never anything but a vowel letter, cf. § 75. The really consonantal *ה* at the end of the word is marked by *Mappiq*.—Verbs containing a *ך* also, according to § 22 *q, r*, share some of the peculiarities of the guttural verbs. For more convenient treatment, the cases will be distinguished, according as the guttural is the first, second, or third radical. (Cf. the Paradigms D, E, F, in which only those conjugations are omitted which are wholly regular.)

§ 63. Verbs First Guttural, e.g. עָמַד to stand.

In this class the deviations from the ordinary strong verb may be *a* referred to the following cases:—

1. Instead of a *simple Šewā mobile*, the initial guttural takes a *compound Šewā* (*Ḥateph*, § 10 f, § 22 l). Thus the *infinitives* עָמַד, אָכַל to eat, and the *perfects*, 2nd plur. masc. עָמַדְתֶּם, אָכַלְתֶּם from חָפַץ to be inclined, correspond to the forms קָטַל and קָטַלְתֶּם; also אָכְלוּ to קָטְלוּ, and so always with initial א־ before a suffix for an original *ā*, according to § 22 o.

2. When a preformative is placed before an initial guttural, either *b* the two may form a closed syllable, or the vowel of the preformative is repeated as a *Ḥateph* under the guttural. If the vowel of the preformative was originally *a*, two methods of formation may again be distinguished, according as this *a* remains or passes into *Seghōl*.

Examples: (*a*) of firmly closed syllables after the original vowel *c* of the preformative (always with *ō* in the second syllable, except וַהֲעֵנֵב Ez 23⁵, וַהֲעֵרָה &c. from עָרָה to adorn oneself, and יַעֲטָה; but cf. *e*): יַהֲמֹד, יַהֲמַל, יַהֲשֹׁב, יַהֲשֹׁךְ, יַעֲקֹב Jer 9³ (probably to distinguish it from the name יַעֲקֹב, just as in Jer 10¹⁹, &c., the participle fem. Niph'al of חָלָה is נַחֲלָה to distinguish it from נָחֲלָה), &c., and so generally in the *imperfect Qal* of stems beginning with ח, although sometimes parallel forms exist, which repeat the *ā* as a *Ḥateph*, e.g. יַהֲשֹׁב, &c. The same form appears also in the *imperfect Hiph'il* וַיַּחֲסִיר, &c. Very rarely the original *ā* is retained in a closed syllable under the preformative *ḥ* of the *perfect Niph'al*: נַחֲבִיאַת Gn 31²⁷; cf. 1 S 19², Jos 2¹⁶; also the *infinitive absolute* נַחֲתוֹם Est 8⁸, נַעֲתוֹר 1 Ch 5²⁰, and the *participle fem.* נַחֲלָה (see above), plur. נַעֲתָרוּ Pr 27⁶. In these forms the original *ā* is commonly kept under the preformative and is followed by *Ḥateph-Pathah*; thus in the *perfect* of some verbs לָלַח, e.g. נַעֲשֶׂה, &c.; in the *infinitive absolute*, נַהֲפֹךְ Est 9¹; in the *participle* נַעֲרִץ ψ 89⁸, &c.

(*b*) Of the corresponding *Ḥateph* after the original vowel: יַהֲבֹשׁ *d* (but יַהֲבֹשׁ Jb 5¹⁸ in pause), יַחֲלֹם, יַעֲמֹד, יַהֲרֹם, and so almost always with *y* and often with *h* in the *imperfects* of *Qal* and *Hiph'il*; in *Hoph'al*, יַהֲעֲמֹד, יַהֲעֲמֹר; but cf. also יַהֲחַמֵּל Is 42²², יַהֲחַמֵּל Ez 16⁴.

The *ā* of the preformative before a guttural almost always (§ 22 i, *c* cf. § 27 p) becomes *Seghōl* (cf., however, *q*). This *Seghōl* again appears sometimes

(*c*) in a closed syllable, e.g. יַהֲבֹשׁ, יַחֲסֹר, יַעֲתֹר, יַאֲשֹׁם, always with *ā* in the second syllable, corresponding to the *imperfects* of verbs עָע, עָע,

with original *i* in the first and *a* in the second syllable, § 67 *n*, and also to the imperfects of verbs יֵאָמֵר, § 72 *h*; but cf. also יֵאָמֵר, יֵאָמֵר, and יֵהָדָף; in *Niph.*, e. g. נִהָדָף Am 6⁶, &c.; in *Hiph.* הֵחֱסִיר הָעָלִים, 2 K 4⁷, &c.: sometimes

(*d*) followed by *Ḥateph-Seghōl*, e. g. יֵהָשֵׁף, יֵאָכֵף, יֵהוּק in *imperfect Qal*; יֵעָמִיד *Hiph'il*; יֵעָשֶׂה *Niphal*.

f Rem. With regard to the above examples the following points may also be noted: (1) The forms with a firmly closed syllable (called the hard combination) frequently occur in the same verb with forms containing a loosely closed syllable (the soft combination). (2) In the 1st *sing. imperfect Qal* the preformative **א** invariably takes *Seghōl*, whether in a firmly or loosely closed syllable, e. g. אֶחָבֵשׁ (with the cohortative אֶחָבֵשֶׁה), אֶחָסֵר (in *pause*), &c. In Jb 32¹⁷ אֶעֱנֶה must unquestionably be *Hiph'il*, since elsewhere the pointing is always אֶעֱנֶה. Cohortatives like אֶהֲרֹג Gn 27⁴¹ and אֶהָדָל Jb 16⁶, are explained by the next remark. (3) The shifting of the tone towards the end frequently causes the *Pathah* of the preformative to change into *Seghōl*, and vice versa, e. g. נִעְשָׂה, but נִעְשִׂיתָ 3rd *sing. fem.*; יֵאָכֵף, but יֵאָכְפִי; הֵעָמִיד, but with *wāw* consecutive וְהֵעָמִיד, &c.; so יֵהָסֵרוּ Gn 8³ the plur. of יֵהָסֵר, cf. Gn 11⁸; and thus generally a change of the stronger *Ḥateph-Seghōl* group (אֶעֱנֶה) into the lighter *Ḥateph-Pathah* group takes place whenever the tone is moved one place toward the end (cf. § 27 *v*).

g 3. When in forms like יֵעָמֵד, נִעְמֵד, the vowel of the final syllable becomes a vocal *Šewā* in consequence of the addition of an affirmative (אֵ, אִ, אָ) or suffix, the compound *Šewā* of the guttural is changed into the corresponding short vowel, e. g. יֵעָמֵד, plur. יֵעָמְדוּ (*ya'-a-me-dhū* as an equivalent for *ya'-ne-dhū*); נִעְוָבָה, plur. נִעְוָבוּ (*she is forsaken*). But even in these forms the hard combination frequently occurs, e. g. יֵהָבְלוּ *they take as a pledge* (cf. in the *sing.* תִּהְבֹּל, also יֵהָבֵל); יֵהָזְקוּ (also יֵהָזְקוּ) *they are strong*. Cf. *m* and, in general, § 22 *m*, § 28 *c*.

h 4. In the *infinitive, imperative, and imperfect Niphal*, where the first radical should by rule be strengthened (יִקְטֹל, יִקְטִיל), the strengthening is always omitted, and the vowel of the preformative lengthened to *Sere*; יֵעָמֵד for *yi'āmēd*,¹ &c. Cf. § 22 *c*.—For הֵינָעֲשֶׂה Ex 25³¹ (according to Dillmann, to prevent the pronunciation הֵנָעֲשֶׂה, which the LXX and Samaritan follow) read הֵנָעֲשֶׂה.

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

i 1. In verbs נִפְעַל the *infinitive construct* and *imperative* take *Ḥateph-Seghōl* in the first syllable (according to § 22 *o*), e. g. אֶזְרָא *gird thou*, Jb 38³, אֶהֱבָא *love thou*,

¹ אֶעֱנֶה Jb 19⁷ (so even the Mantua ed.) is altogether abnormal: read אֶעֱנֶה, with Baer, Ginsb.

Ho 3¹, אָחֹז *seize thou*, Ex 4⁴ (on אָפֹז *bake ye*, Ex 16²³, see § 76 *d*); אָכַל *to eat*; infinitive with a prefix אֹחֹז, אֹכֵל, אֹכֵלִים Is 5²⁴; אָכַח Ec 3⁸. Sometimes, however, *Hateph-Pathah* is found as well, e. g. infinitive אָחֹז I K 6⁶; אֹכֵל הָאֵשׁ Nu 26¹⁰ (before a suffix אֹכֵלְךָ, אֹמְרֶם, אֹמְרֵם § 61 *d*); cf. Dt 7²⁰, 12²³, Ez 25⁸, ψ 102⁵, Pr 25⁷ (אֹמְרֵךְ), Jb 34¹⁸, always in close connexion with the following word. With a firmly closed syllable after ל cf. לֶחֶסֶת Is 30²; לֶחֶפֶר Jos 2²¹. (on Is 2²⁰, cf. § 84^b *n*); לֶחֶתוֹת Is 30¹⁴, Hag 2¹⁶; קָחֶשֶׁב Ex 31⁴, &c.; לָעוֹר 2 S 18³ *Qere*, but also בָּעוֹר I Ch 15²⁶.

הַחֲדָלְתִּי Ju 9^{9,11,13} is altogether anomalous, and only a few authorities give *k* (Hiph'il), adopted by Moore in Haupt's Bible. According to Qimhi, Olshausen, and others, the Masora intended a *perfect Hoph'al* with syncope of the preformative after the ה interrogative = הַחֲדָלְתִּי, or (according to Olshausen) with the omission of the ה interrogative. But since the *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* of חָדַל nowhere occur, it is difficult to believe that such was the intention of the Masora. We should expect the *perfect Qal*, הַחֲדָלְתִּי. But the *Qames* under the ח, falling between the tone and counter-tone, was naturally less emphasized than in חָדַלְתִּי, without the ה interrogative. Consequently it was weakened, not to simple *Sewa*, but to $\frac{---}{---}$, in order to represent the sound of the *Qames* (likewise pronounced as *â*) at least in a shortened form. The *Seghol* of the ה interrogative is explained, in any case, from § 100 *n* (cf. the similar pointing of the article, e. g. in הַחֲדָשִׁים § 35 *k*). For the accusative after חָדַל, instead of the usual מִן, Jb 3¹⁷ affords sufficient evidence.

Also in the other forms of the *imperative* the guttural not infrequently influences the vowel, causing a change of *i* (on this *i* cf. § 48 *i*) into *Seghol*, e. g. אִסְפָּה *gather thou*, Nu 11¹⁶; עֲרְכָה *set in order*, Jb 33⁵; חִשְׁפֵּי *strip off*, Is 47² (on this irregular *Dages* cf. § 46 *d*), especially when the second radical is also a guttural, e. g. אֶהְבֶּה Am 5¹⁵, ψ 31²⁴; cf. Zc 8¹⁰; אֶחֱזֶה Ct 2¹⁵; cf. also in verbs לִ"ה עֲנֵנִי *sing ye*, Nu 21¹⁷, ψ 147⁷ (compared with עֲנֵנִי *answer ye*, 1 S 12³) and אֶלִּי Jo 1⁸.—*Pathah* occurs in חָבַלְהוּ *hold him in pledge*, Pr 20¹⁶, and probably also in ψ 9¹⁴ (חֲנִנִי).—As a pausal form for חָרַבְתִּי (cf. the plur. Jer 2¹²) we find in Is 44²⁷ חָרַבְתִּי (cf. the imperf. יִחָרַב) with the *ô* repeated in the form of a *Hateph-Qames*. For other examples of this kind, see § 10 *h* and § 46 *e*.

2. The pronunciation (mentioned above, No. 2) of the imperfects in *â* with *m* *Seghol* under the preformative in a firmly closed syllable (e. g. יִחָדַל, יִחָכֵם) regularly gives way to the soft combination in verbs which are at the same time ל"ה, e. g. יִחַהּ, יִחַחֵה &c. (but cf. יִהְיֶה &c., יִהְיֶה Pr 6²⁷, אֶעֱשֶׂה ed. Mant., Ex 3²⁰). Even in the strong verb יִחַיְהוֹק is found along with יִחֹק. Cf. also וַיַּעֲבֵב Ez 23⁵; וַיַּעֲבֵבִי Gn 27³⁶ (so Ben-Asher; but Ben-Naphtali וַיַּעֲבֵב); וַיַּחֲלֵק Neh 9²², and so always in the *imperfect Qal* of עוֹר with suffixes, Gn 49²⁵, &c.—וַיִּתְאַבְּבוּ Pr 1²² is to be explained from the endeavour to avoid too great an accumulation of short sounds by the insertion of a long vowel, but it is a question whether we should not simply read וַיִּתְאַבְּבוּ with Haupt in his Bible, *Proverbs*, p. 34, l. 44 ff.; cf. the analogous instances under *p*, and

such nouns as **בָּאֵר**, **זֶאֱב**, § 93 *t*.—On **יִחְבֶּרֶךְ** ψ 94²⁰ for **יִחְבֶּרֶךְ** (according to Qimhi, and others, rather *Pu'al*) cf. § 60 *b*.

n **יִאֲטֹם** ψ 58⁵ and **יִעֲרֹם** to deal subtilly, 1 S 23²², Pr 15⁵, 19²⁵, may be explained with Barth (*ZDMG*. 1889, p. 179) as *i*-imperfects (see above, § 47 *i*),—the latter for the purpose of distinction from the causative **יַעֲרִים** ψ 83⁴.—Instead of the unintelligible form **וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם** (so ed. Mant.; Baer and Ginsb. as in 24⁹) 1 Ch 23⁶ and **וַיִּזְרֹק** 24⁸ (partly analogous to **תַּעֲבֶדֶם** § 60 *b*) the Qal **וַיַּחֲלֶקֶם** is to be read. The form **יִרְדֶּף** ψ 7⁶ which is, according to Qimhi (in *Mikhlol*; but in his Lexicon he explains it as *Hithpa'el*), a composite form of Qal (**יִרְדֶּף**) and *Pi'el* (**יִרְדֶּף**), can only be understood as a development of **יִרְדֶּף** (cf. § 64 *h* on **יִצְחָק**, and § 69 *x* on **תִּהְלֶךְ** Ex 9²³, ψ 73⁹). Pathah has taken the place of *Hateph-Pathah*, but as a mere helping-vowel (as in **שִׁמְעָתָי** § 28 *e*, note 2) and without preventing the closing of the syllable. It is much simpler, however, to take it as a *forma mixta*, combining the readings **יִרְדֶּף** (impf. Qal) and **יִרְדֶּף** (impf. *Pi'el*).

II. On *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

O 3. The above-mentioned (*f*, 3) change of $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}} \frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ to $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}} \frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ occurs in the perfect *Hiph'il*, especially when *wāw* consecutive precedes, and the tone is in consequence thrown forward upon the affirmative, e. g. **וַיַּעֲמֶדְתָּ**, but **וַיַּעֲמֶדְתָּ** Nu 3⁶, 8¹³, 27¹⁹; **וַיַּעֲבֶרְתָּ**, but **וַיַּעֲבֶרְתָּ** Jer 15¹⁴, Ez 20³⁷; even in the 3rd sing. **וַיִּזְאֶזֶן** ψ 77².—On the contrary $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}} \frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ occurs instead of $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}} \frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ in the imperative *Hiph'il*, Jer 49^{8,30}; and in the infinitive Jer 31³². The preformative of **עָתֵר** in *Hiph'il* always takes *a* in a closed syllable: Ex 8⁴ **וַיַּעֲתִירוּ**; verse 5 **וַיַּעֲתִיר**; also verse 25 and Jb 22²⁷.

p 4. In the perfect *Hiph'il* $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}} \frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ is sometimes changed into $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}} \frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$, and in *Hoph'al* $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}} \frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ into $\frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}} \frac{\text{---}}{\text{---}}$ (cf. § 23 *h*); **וַיַּעֲבֶרְתָּ** Jos 7⁷, **וַיַּעֲלָה** Hb 11¹⁵, **וַיַּעֲלָה** Ju 6²⁸, 2 Ch 20³⁴, Na 2⁸, always before *ʿ*, and hence evidently with the intention of strengthening the countertone-syllable (הֶ or הָ) before the guttural. On a further case of this kind (**וַיַּעֲמָה**) see § 64 *c*. Something similar occurs in the formation of segholate nouns of the form *qōʿl*; cf. § 93 *q*, and (on **וַיַּמְוֶן** &c. for **וַיַּמְוֶן**) § 84^a *q*.—In the imperfect consecutive **וַיַּחֲזֶק** the tone is thrown back on to the first syllable. On the *Hoph'al* **וַיַּעֲבֶדֶם** Ex 20⁵, &c., see § 60 *b*.

III. הָיָה and חָיָה.

q 5. In the verbs **הָיָה** to be, and **חָיָה** to live, the guttural hardly ever affects the addition of preformatives; thus imperfect Qal **יִהְיֶה** and **יִחְיֶה**, *Niph'al* **נִהְיֶה**; but in the perfect *Hiph'il* **וַיִּהְיֶה** (2nd plur. **וַיִּהְיֶיִם** Jos 2¹³, and even without *wāw* consecutive, Ju 8¹⁹). Initial ה always has *Hateph-Seghol* instead of vocal *Šewā*; **הָיָה**, **חָיָה**, **הָיוּ**, **חָיוּ** 1 S 25⁷, **הָיִיתָ** (except **הָיִי** be thou! fem. Gn 24⁶⁰). The 2nd sing. fem. imperative of **חָיָה** is **חַיִּי** live thou, Ez 16⁶; the infinitive, with suffix, **חַיִּיתָם** Jos 5⁸. After the prefixes **וַיַּחֲזֶק**, **וַיַּחֲזֶק**, **וַיַּחֲזֶק**, **וַיַּחֲזֶק** (= **חַיִּי**) both ה and ח retain the simple *Šewā* (§ 28 *b*) and the prefix takes *z*, as elsewhere before strong consonants with *Šewā*; hence in the perfect Qal **וַיִּהְיֶה**, imperative **וַיִּחְיֶה**, infinitive **וַיִּחְיֶה**, &c. (cf. § 16 *f*, *ε*). The only exception is the 2nd sing. masc. of the imperative after *wāw*; **וַיִּחְיֶה** Gn 12², &c., **וַיִּחְיֶה** Gn 20⁷.

§ 64. Verbs Middle Guttural, e.g. שָׁחַט to slaughter.

The slight deviations from the ordinary inflexion are confined *a* chiefly to the following¹ :—

1. When the guttural would stand at the beginning of a syllable with simple *Šewâ*, it necessarily takes a *Ḥateph*, and almost always *Ḥateph-Pathah*, e.g. perfect שָׁחַט, imperfect יִשְׁחַט, imperative נִפְחַט הַשְׁחַט. In the imperative *Qal*, before the affirmatives *î* and *û*, the original *Pathah* is retained in the first syllable, and is followed by *Ḥateph-Pathah*, thus, וְעָקִי, וְעָקִי, &c.; in אֶחָבִי the preference of the א for *Sēghôl* (but cf. also יֶאֱחָבִי Jer 13²¹) has caused the change from *ā* to *ē*; in שָׁחַדִּי Jb 6²², even *î* remains before a *hard* guttural.

So in the infinitive *Qal fem.*, e.g. אֶחָבָה to love, דָּאָבָה to pine; and in the infinitive with a suffix לְכַעֲרָה Is 9⁶; the doubtful form שְׁחַטָּה Ho 5², is better explained as infinitive *Pi'el* (= שְׁחַתָּה).

2. Since the preference of the gutturals for the *a*-sound has less *b* influence on the following than on the preceding vowel, not only is *Holem* retained after the middle guttural in the infinitive *Qal* שָׁחַט (with the fem. ending and retraction and shortening of the *o* רַחֲצָה and רַחֲצָה, cf. § 45 *b*), but generally also the *Sere* in the imperfect *Niph'al* and *Pi'el*, e.g. יִלָּחֵם he fights, יִנַּחֵם he comforts, and even the more feeble *Sēghôl* after *wāw* consecutive in such forms as וַיִּלָּחֵם וַיִּנַּחֵם Gn 41⁸ (cf., however, וַיִּנַּחֵם 1 K 12⁶, &c. But in the imperative and imperfect *Qal*, the final syllable, through the influence of the guttural, mostly takes *Pathah*, even in transitive verbs, e.g. שָׁחַט, יִשְׁחַט; וְעָקִי, יִבְחַר, בָּחַר; with suffixes (according to § 60 *c*), imperative יִשְׁחַטְנִי, בָּחַטְנִי, imperfect יִשְׁחַטְהוּ, יִבְחַטְהוּ.

With *ō* in the imperative *Qal*, the only instances are נַעַל 2 S 13¹⁷; אָחֹז Ex 4¹, 2 S 2²¹, fem. אֶחָזִי Ru 3¹⁵ (with the unusual repetition of the lost *ō* as *Ḥateph-Qames*; 2nd plur. masc. in pause אֶחָזוּ Neh 7³; without the pause אֶחָזוּ Ct 2¹⁵); סָעַר Ju 19⁸.² Finally וְעָמָה for וְעָמָה, Nu 23⁷, is an example of the same kind, see § 63 *p*. Just as rare are the imperfections in *ō* of verbs middle guttural, as יִנַּחֵם, יִאָחֹז, תִּמְעַל Lv 5¹⁵, Nu 5²⁷ (but וְיִמְעַל 2 Ch 26¹⁶); cf. וְיִשְׁחַטְהוּ Ez 16³⁸; תִּפְעַל Jb 35⁶. Also in the perfect *Pi'el*, *Pathah* occurs somewhat more frequently than in the strong verb, e.g. נָחַם to comfort (cf., however, בָּחַר, בָּחַר, שָׁחַט);

¹ *Hoph'al*, which is not exhibited in the paradigm, follows the analogy of *Qal*; *Hiph'il* is regular.

² Also Ju 16⁵ (where Qimhi would read *sē'ād*, read *sē'ōd*, and on the use of the conjunctive accent (here *Darga*) as a substitute for Metheg, cf. § 9 *u* (c) and § 16 *b*).

but **א** and **י** always have *ē* in 3rd *sing.*—On the *infinitive* with suffixes, cf. § 61 b.

d 3. In *Pi'el*, *Pu'al*, and *Hithpa'el*, the *Dageš forte* being inadmissible in the middle radical, the preceding vowel, especially before ה, ח, and ע, nevertheless, generally remains short, and the guttural is consequently to be regarded as, at least, *virtually* strengthened, cf. § 22 c; e.g. *Pi'el* שָׁחַק נִחְלִי Jos 14¹, יִבְעֲרָתִי 1 K 14¹⁰, נָהַג Ex 10¹³ (cf., however, אָחַר Gn 34¹⁹; יָהֲלֵתָ Ex 15¹³, but in the *imperfect* and *participle* יִנְהַל, &c.; in verbs ל"ה, e.g. (רָעָה), *infinitive* שָׁחַק, *Pu'al* רָחַץ (but cf. דָּחָה ψ 36¹³ from דָּחָה, also the unusual position of the tone in בָּחַן¹ Ez 21¹⁸, and in the *perfect* *Hithpa'el* הִתְרַחֲצִיתִי Jb 9³⁰); *Hithpa'el perfect* and *imperative* הִטְהַרְרִי, &c.; in *pause* (see §§ 22 c, 27 q, 29 v, 54 k) הִטְהַרְרִי Nu 8⁷, 2 Ch 30¹⁸; יִתְנַחֵם Nu 23¹⁹, &c.

e The complete omission of the strengthening, and a consequent lengthening of the preceding vowel, occurs invariably only with ר (פָּרַח Ez 16⁴ is an exception; פָּרַחְתָּ also occurs, Ju 6²⁸), e.g. פָּרַח (in *pause* פָּרַחְתָּ), *imperfect* יִפְרַח, *Pu'al* פִּרַּח. Before **א** it occurs regularly in the stems בָּאָר, גָּאָל, מָאָן, פָּאָר, and in the *Hithpa'el* of בָּאָשׁ, רָאָה, and שָׂאָה; on the other hand, **א** is *virtually* strengthened in the *perfects*, נָאָף (once in the *imperfect*, Jer 29²³) *to commit adultery*, נִאָץ *to despise* (in the *participle*, Nu 14²³, Is 60¹⁴, Jer 23¹⁷; according to Baer, but not ed. Mant., or Ginsb., even in the *imperfect* יִנְאֹץ ψ 74¹⁰), נָאָר *to abhor* La 2⁷ (also נִאָרְתָּה ψ 89⁴⁰) and שִׂאָל ψ 109¹⁰; moreover, in the *infinitive* יֵאָשׁ Ec 2²⁰, according to the best reading. On the *Mappiq* in the *Pu'al* רָאָה Jb 33²¹, cf. § 14 d.

f Rem. 1. In the verb שָׂאָל *to ask, to beg*, some forms of the *perfect Qal* appear to be based upon a secondary form *middle e*, which is *Sere* when the vowel of the **א** stands in an open syllable, cf. שָׂאָלְךָ Gn 32¹⁸, Ju 4²⁰; שָׂאָלִנִּי ψ 137³; but in a closed syllable, even without a suffix, שָׂאָלְתָם 1 S 12¹³, 25⁵, Jb 21²⁹; שָׂאָלְתִּיהוּ Ju 13⁶, 1 S 1²⁰. Cf., however, similar cases of attenuation of an original *ā*, § 69 s, and especially § 44 d. In the first three examples, if explained on that analogy, the *i* attenuated from *ā* would have been lengthened to *ē* (before the tone); in the next three *i* would have been modified to *ē*. Also in the *Hiph'il*-form הִשְׂאָלְתִּיהוּ 1 S 1²⁸ the **א** is merely attenuated from **א**.

g 2. In *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* the lengthening of the vowel before the guttural causes the tone to be thrown back upon the penultima, and consequently the *Sere* of the ultima to be shortened to *S^eghôl*. Thus (a) before monosyllables, according to § 29 e, e.g. לְשָׂרָתָם שָׁם *to minister there*, Dt 17¹², even in the case of a guttural which is *virtually* strengthened, Gn 39¹⁴, Jb 8¹⁸ (see § 29 g). (b) after *wāw* consecutive, e.g. וַיְבָרֶכֶּךָ and *he blessed*, Gn 1²² and frequently, וַיִּגְרֶשׁ and *he drove out*, Ex 10¹¹, וַיִּתְפַּעֵם Dn 2¹.

¹ בָּחַן is explained by Abulwalid as the 3rd pers. *perfect Pu'al*, but by Qimhi as a noun.

3. The following are a few rarer anomalies; in the *imperfect Qal* יִצְחָק Gn 21⁶ *h* (elsewhere הִצְחָק, &c., in *pause* יִצְחָק, cf. § 10 g (c) and § 63 n); וָאָחָר Gn 32⁵ (for וְאָחָר); in the *perfect Pi'el* אָהָרָו Ju 5²⁸ (perhaps primarily for אָהָרוּ; according to Gn 34¹⁹ אָהָרוּ would be expected), and similarly יִחַמְתִּנִּי ψ 51⁷ for יִחַמְתִּנִּי; in the *imperative Pi'el* קָרַב Ez 37¹⁷ (cf. above, § 52 n); finally, in the *imperative Hiph'il* הֲרַחַק Jb 13²¹ הֲמַעַד ψ 69²⁴, in both cases probably influenced by the closing consonant, and by the preference for *Pathah* in *pause* (according to § 29 g); without the *pause* הֲרַחַק Pr 4²⁴, &c.; but also הֲנַחַח Jo 4¹¹.

4. As *infinitive Hithpa'el* with a suffix we find הִתְיַחֵשׁ Ezr 8¹, &c., with *i* a firmly closed syllable, also the *participle* מִתְיַחֵשׁ Neh 7⁶⁴; Baer, however, reads in all these cases, on good authority, הִתְיַחֵשׁ &c.—The quite meaningless *Kethibh* וְנִאֲשָׂא Ez 9⁸ (for which the *Qere* requires the equally unintelligible וְנִשְׂאָר) evidently combines two different readings, viz. וְנִשְׂאָר (*part. Niph.*) and וְנִאֲשָׂא (*imperf. consec.*); cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. p. 266 f.—In יִתְאַרְהוּ Is 44¹³ (also יִתְאַרְהוּ in the same verse) an *imperfect Pô'el* appears to be intended by the Masora with an irregular shortening of the *ô* for יִתְאַרְ; cf. § 55 b מִלְשֵׁנִי ψ 101⁵ *Qere*; on the other hand Qimhi, with whom Delitzsch agrees, explains the form as *Pi'el*, with an irregular ־ for ־ , as in the reading אֶלְקָמָה Ru 2²⁷; cf. § 10 h.

5. A few examples in which *℣*, as middle radical, entirely loses its consonantal value and quiesces in a vowel, will be found in § 73 g.

§ 65. *Verbs Third Guttural*, e.g. שָׁלַח to send.¹

1. According to § 22 d, when the last syllable has a vowel incompatible with the guttural (i.e. *not* an *a*-sound), two possibilities present themselves, viz. either the regular vowel *remains*, and the guttural then takes *furtive Pathah*, or *Pathah* (in *pause Qames*) takes its place. More particularly it is to be remarked that—

(a) The unchangeable vowels ־ , ־ , ־ (§ 25 b) are always retained, even under such circumstances; hence *inf. abs. Qal* שָׁלֹחַ, *part. pass.* שָׁלֹחַ, *Hiph.* הִשְׁלִיחַ, *imperf.* יִשְׁלֹחַ, *part.* מִשְׁלִיחַ. So also the less firm ־ in the *inf. constr.* שְׁלַח is almost always retained: cf., however, שְׁלַח, in close connexion with a substantive, Is 58⁹, and שְׁלַח Nu 20³. Examples of the *infinitive* with suffixes are שְׁלַחְךָ Gn 35¹; שְׁלַחְנוּ Nu 35¹⁰; שְׁלַחְנוּ Lv 18²³, &c.

(b) The *imperfect* and *imperative Qal* almost always have *ä* in the *b* second syllable, sometimes, no doubt, due simply to the influence of the guttural (for a tone-long ־ , originally ־), but sometimes as being the original vowel, thus שְׁלַח, שְׁלַח, &c.; with suffixes שְׁלַחְנוּ, שְׁלַחְנוּ, see § 60 c.

¹ Verbs שָׁלַח in which the ה is *consonantal* obviously belong also to this class, e.g. שְׁלַחְךָ to be high, שְׁלַחְךָ to be astonished, שְׁלַחְךָ (only in *Hithpa'el*) to delay.

Exceptions, in the *imperfect* אָסְלוֹחַ Jer 57, *Keth.* אָסְלוֹחַ (*Qerê*); in the *imperative* טָבַח Gn 43¹⁶. On such cases as אָפְשָׁעָה Is 27⁴, cf. § 10 h.

c (c) Where *Sere* would be the regular vowel of the final syllable, both forms (with \bar{e}^a and \bar{a}) are sometimes in use; the choice of one or the other is decided by the special circumstances of the tone, i. e. :—

d Rem. 1. In the *absolute state* of the *participle* Qal, Pi'el and Hithpa'el, the forms שָׁלַח (with suff. שְׁלַחְיָה, but שְׁלַחְךָ), מִשְׁלַח (with suff. מִשְׁלַחְךָ), and מִשְׁתַּלֵּעַ are used exclusively; except in verbs לָעַץ where we find, in close connexion, also נָטַע ψ 94⁹, רָבַע Is 51¹⁵, Jer 31³⁶, רָקַע Is 42⁶, 44²⁴, רוֹקַע ψ 136⁶, שָׁעַע Lv 11⁷, all with the tone on the last syllable.—The part. Pu'al is מִרְבֵּעַ Ez 45² according to the best authorities (Kittel מִרְבֵּעַ).

e 2. Similarly, in the *imperf.* and *inf. Niph'al*, and in the *perf. inf.* and *imperf. Pi'el* the (probably more original) form with \bar{a} commonly occurs in the body of the sentence, and the fuller form with \bar{e}^a in *pause* (and even with the lesser distinctives, e.g. with *Dhi* ψ 86⁴ in the *imperative* Pi'el; with *Tiph'ha* 1 K 12³² in the *infinitive* Pi'el; Jer 4³¹ *imperfect* Hithpa'el; Jer 16⁶ *imperfect* Niph'al), cf. e.g. יָרַע Nu 27⁴, with יָרַעַ 36³; וַיִּשְׁבַּע Dt 18⁴, even with retraction of the tone in the *inf. abs. Niph'al* הִשְׁבַּע Nu 30³ (elsewhere הִשְׁבַּע Jer 7⁹, 12¹⁶ twice, in each case without the pause); הִבְבַּעַ Hb 3⁹, with תִּבְבַּעַ Ez 13¹¹; בָּלַע to devour Hb 1¹³, Nu 4²⁰ with בָּלַעַ La 2⁸; for *infinitive* Hithpa'el, cf. Is 28²⁰. The *infinitive absolute* Pi'el has the form שָׁלַח Dt 22⁷, 1 K 11²²; the *infinitive construct*, on the other hand, when without the pause is always as שָׁלַח except לְשַׁלַּח Ex 10⁴.—יִוְבַח Hb 1¹⁶ has \bar{e} , though not in *pause*, and even יִוְבַחַ 2 K 16⁴, 2 Ch 28⁴; but \bar{a} in *pause* in the *imperative* Niph'al הִאָּנַח Ez 21¹¹; *jussive* Pi'el תִּאָּחַר ψ 40¹⁸; cf. § 52 n. An example of \bar{a} in the *imperative* Pi'el under the influence of a final \bar{r} is בְּתַר־ Jb 36², in the *imperfect* Niph'al וַתַּעֲצֹר Nu 17¹³, &c.—In יִפְרַח Jb 14⁹ (cf. ψ 92¹⁴, Pr 14¹¹), Barth (see above, § 63 n) finds an *i-imperfect* of Qal, since the intransitive meaning is only found in Qal.

f 3. In the 2nd *sing. masc.* of the *imperative*, and in the forms of the *jussive* and *imperfect consecutive* of Hiph'il which end in gutturals, \bar{a} alone occurs, e.g. הִצַּלְתָּ prosper thou, יִבְטַח let him make to trust, וַיִּצְמַח and he made to grow (so in Hithpa'el יִתְמַחְמַח, &c., Hb 2³); even in *pause* וַיִּצְלַח 1 Ch 29²³, and, with the best authorities, יִוְבַחַ 1 Ch 12¹⁷; וַיִּשְׁעֶבְם Is 35⁴ is perhaps to be emended into וַיִּשְׁעַ (= וַיִּשְׁעִיעַ).—In the *infinitive absolute* *Sere* remains, e.g. הִנְבִּיחַ to make high; as *infinitive construct* הוֹבִיחַ also occurs in close connexion (Jb 6²⁶); on הוֹשִׁיעַ as *infinitive construct* (1 S 25^{26.33}), cf. § 53 k.

g 2. When the guttural with *quiescent* Šwā stands at the end of a syllable, the ordinary strong form remains when not connected with suffixes, e.g. שְׁלַחְתִּי, שְׁלַחְתָּ. But in the 2nd *sing. fem. perfect* a *helping-Pathah* takes the place of the Šwā, שְׁלַחְתְּ Jer 13²⁵ (§ 28 e); also in 1 K 14³, לְחַתְּ is to be read, not לְחַתָּ.

h Rem. The soft combination with compound Šwā occurs only in the 1st *plur. perfect* with suffixes, since in these forms the tone is thrown one place farther forward, e.g. יָדַעְנוּךָ we know thee, Ho 8² (cf. Gn 26²⁹, ψ 44¹⁸, 132⁶). Before the suffixes ךָּ and כֶּם, the guttural must have \bar{e} , e.g. אֶשְׁלַחְךָ I will send thee, 1 S 16¹; וְאֶשְׁלַחְךָ Gn 31²⁷; אֶשְׁמַעְךָ Jer 18².

On the weak verbs אָלַא, see especially § 74.

II. The Weak Verb.¹

§ 66. *Verbs Primae Radicalis Nûn* (נ), e.g. נָשַׁב to approach.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 138 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 595 ff.

The weakness of initial נ consists chiefly in its suffering *aphaeresis* *a* in the *infinitive construct* and *imperative* in some of these verbs (cf. § 19 *h*). On the other hand, the *assimilation* of the נ (see below) cannot properly be regarded as weakness, since the triliteral character of the stem is still preserved by the strengthening of the second consonant. The special points to be noticed are—

1. The *aphaeresis* of the Nûn (*a*) in the *infinitive construct*. This *b* occurs only (though not necessarily) in those verbs which have *a* in the second syllable of the *imperfect*. Thus from the stem נגש, *imperfect* נִשֶּׂה, *infinitive* properly נִשֶּׂה, but always lengthened by the feminine termination ת to the segholate form נִשְׁתֶּה²; with *suffix* נִשְׁתֶּה Gn 33³; with the concurrence of a guttural נִשֶּׂה to touch, *imperfect* נִשֶּׂה, *infinitive* נִשְׁתֶּה (also נִשֶּׂה, see below); נָטַע to plant, *infinitive* נָטַע (also נָטַע, see below); on the verb נָתַן to give, see especially *h* and *i*. On the other hand, *aphaeresis* does not take place in verbs which have *o* in the *imperfect*, e.g. נָפַל to fall, *imperfect* יָפַל, *infinitive* נָפַל, with *suffix* נָפַלו, also נָפְלוּ; נָהַר Nu 6², &c.; cf., moreover, לָנַע Gn 20⁶, &c., וְנָנַע Ex 19¹² (even לָנַנַע Jb 6⁷; cf. Jer 1¹⁰); with *suffix* בָּנַנְעוּ Lv 15²³. Also לָנַטַע Is 51¹⁶ (but לָטַע Ec 3²); נָשָׂה Is 1¹⁴, 18³; with *suffix* בָּנַשְׂאֵי ψ 28² (elsewhere נָשָׂה, cf. § 74 *i* and § 76 *b*), לָנַשְׂקָה 2 S 20⁹.

(*b*) In the *imperative*. Here the *Nûn* is always dropped in verbs *c* with *a* in the *imperfect*, e.g. נָשַׁב, *imperative* נִשֶּׂה (more frequently with *paragogic* *a*, נִשְׁה; before *Maqqeph* also נִשֶּׂה Gn 19⁹), *plur.* נִשְׂוּ, &c. Parallel with these there are the curious forms with *o*, נִשִּׁי Ru 2¹⁴ (with *retarding* *Metheg* in the second syllable, and also *nasog 'ahor*, according to § 29 *e*, before הָלַם) and נִשִּׁי Jos 3⁹ (before הָלַם), 1 S 14²⁸ (before הָלַם) and 2 Ch 29³¹; in all these cases without the *pause*. With *Nûn* retained, as if in a strong verb, נָהַג drive, 2 K 4²⁴ (*imperfect* יִנְהֶה, without assimilation of the *Nûn*), וְנִמְטַע 2 K 19²⁹, Is 37³⁰, Jer 29^{5.28}; cf. also the verbs נָהַל, which are at the same time נָהַל Ez 32¹⁸, נָחַה Ex 32³⁴, נָחַה Ex 8¹, &c.; the verb נָשָׂה ψ 10¹² (usually נִשֶּׂה); cf. § 76 *b*. But, as in the *infinitive*, the *aphaeresis* never takes place in verbs which have *o* in the *imperfect*, e.g. נָצַר, נָתַן, &c.

¹ Cf. the summary, § 41.

² The law allowing the addition of the feminine termination to the unlengthened form, instead of a lengthening of the vowel, is suitably called by Barth 'the law of compensation' (*Nominalbildung*, p. xiii).

d 2. When, through the addition of a *preformative*, *Nûn* stands at the end of a syllable, it is readily assimilated to the second radical (§ 19 c); thus in the *imperfect Qal*,¹ e.g. יָפַל for *yinpāl*, *he will fall*; יָנַח for *yingaš*; יָתַן for *yintēn*, *he will give* (on this single example of an *imperfect* with original *i* in the second syllable, cf. *h*)²; also in the *perfect Niph'al* נָנַח for *ningaš*; throughout *Hiph'il* (הִנִּיחַ, &c.) and *Hoph'al* (which in these verbs always has *Qibbuš*, in a sharpened syllable, cf. § 9 n) הִנִּיחַ.

The other forms are all quite regular, e.g. the *perfect, infinitive absolute* and *participle Qal*, all *Pi'el*, *Pu'al*, &c.

In Paradigm H, only those conjugations are given which differ from the regular form.

c The characteristic of these verbs in all forms with a *preformative* is *Dageš* following it in the second radical. Such forms, however, are also found in certain verbs פָּ"נ (§ 71), and even in verbs עָ"ע (§ 67). The *infinitive* נָשַׁת and the *imperative* נָשֵׁ, also נָשֵׁ (Gn 19⁹) and יָתַן, resemble the corresponding forms of verbs פָּ"נ (§ 69).—On יָקַח, קָח, and קָחַת, from לָקַח to *take*, see *g*.—In יָקַח (imperfect *Niph'al* of קָח), and in similar forms of verbs עָ"ע (§ 72), the full writing of the *ō* indicates, as a rule, that they are not to be regarded as *imperfects Qal* of קָחַת, &c.—Also נָסַח (ψ 139⁸) is not to be derived from נָסַח, but stands for נָסַחַל (with a sharpening of the *Ḍ* as compensation for the loss of the *l*), from סָלַח to *ascend*, see § 19 f, and Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 44. Similarly the *Hiph'il*-forms הִשָּׁקִי Ez 39⁹, הִשָּׁק Is 44¹⁵, and the *Niph'al* נִשְׁקָה ψ 78²¹ are most probably from a stem שָׁלַק, not נִשָּׁק.

f Rem. 1. The instances are comparatively few in which the forms retain their *Nûn* before a firm consonant, e.g. נָטַר, imperfect יִנְטָר Jer 3⁵ (elsewhere יָנַר); also from נָצַר the pausal form is always יִנְצָרו (without the *pause* יָצָרו Pr 20²⁸); similarly in Is 29¹, 58³, ψ 61⁸, 68³ (where, however, יִנְצָרו is intended), 140^{2,5}, Pr 2¹¹, Jb 40²¹, the retention of the *Nûn* is always connected with the *pause*. In *Niph'al* this never occurs (except in the irregular *inf.* בָּהֲנִיחַ ψ 68³, cf. § 51 k), in *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* very seldom; e.g. לְהַנְחִיחַ Ez 22²⁰, הַנְחִיחוּ Ju 20³¹; for לְנַפֵּל Nu 5²² read לְנַפֵּל, according to § 53 g. On the other hand, the *Nûn* is regularly retained in all verbs, of which the second radical is a guttural, e.g. יִנְחַל *he will possess*, although there are rare cases like יִחַת (also יִנְחַת) *he will descend*, Jer 21¹³ (even יִחַת Pr 17¹⁰; without apparent reason accented as *Mi'el*), plur. יִחַתוּ Jb 21¹³ (cf. § 20 i; the Masora, however, probably regards יִחַת and יִחַתוּ as *imperfect Niph'al* from יָחַת); *Niph'al* נָחַם for נִנְחַם *he has grieved*.

g 2. The *l* of לָקַח to *take* is treated like the *Nûn* of verbs פָּ"נ (§ 19 d). Hence *imperfect Qal* יָקַח, cohortative (§ 20 m) אֲקַחָה, *imperative* קַח, in *pause* and

¹ Cf. Mayer Lambert, 'Le futur qal des verbes פָּ"נ, פָּ"נ, פָּ"א, פָּ"א' in the *REJ.* xxxvii. 136 ff.

² An imperfect in *a* (יָנַח) is given in the Paradigm, simply because it is the actual form in use in this verb.

before *suffixes* קָח (on קָח־נָא Gn 48⁹, see § 61 g), *paragogic form* קָחָה; קָחִי, &c. (but cf. also לָקַח Ex 29¹, Ez 37¹⁶, Pr 20¹⁶, לָקַחִי 1 K 17¹¹, perhaps a mistake for קָחִי לָהּ, cf. LXX and Lucian); *infinitive construct* קָחַת (once קָחַת 2 K 12⁹, cf. § 93 h); with לְ, לְקַחַת; with *suffix* קָחַתִּי; *Hoph'al* (cf., however, § 53 u) *imperfect* יִקַּח; *Niph'al*, however, is always יִקְלַח.—The meaningless form קָח Ez 17⁵ is a mistake; for the equally meaningless קָחַם Ho 11³ read וַיִּקְחֵם.

3. The verb יָנַח to give, mentioned above in d, is the only example of a *h* verb י"פ with *imperfect* in יָנַח (יָנַח for yintān; יָנַח¹ only in Ju 16⁵, elsewhere before *Maqqeph* יָנַח־, &c.), and a corresponding *imperative* יָנַח or (very frequently) הִנָּה (but in ψ 8² the very strange reading הִנָּה is no doubt simply meant by the Masora to suggest יָנַח־); before *Maqqeph* יָנַח־, *fem.* הִנָּה־, &c. Moreover, this very common verb has the peculiarity that its final *Nûn*, as a weak nasal, is also assimilated; יָנַח־ for nāthānā, יָנַח־ or, very frequently, יָנַח־, with a kind of orthographic compensation for the assimilated *Nûn* (cf. § 44 g); *Niph'al perfect* יָנַחַם Lv 26²⁵, Ezr 9⁷.

In the *infinitive construct Qal* the ground-form *tint* is not lengthened to *tēneth* (as יָנַח־ from יָנַח־), but contracted to *titt*, which is then correctly lengthened to יָנַח־, with the omission of *Dageš forte* in the final consonant, see § 20 l; but with *suffixes* יָנַח־, יָנַח־, &c.; before *Maqqeph* with the prefix לְ=לְיָנַח־, e. g. Ex 5²¹, and even when closely connected by other means, e. g. Gn 15⁷. However, the strong formation of the *infinitive construct* also occurs in יָנַח Nu 20²¹ and יָנַח־ Gn 38⁹; cf. § 69 m, note 2. On the other hand, for יָנַח־ 1 K 6¹⁹ read either לְיָנַח־ or simply יָנַח־, just as the *Qerê*, 1 K 17¹⁴, requires יָנַח־ for יָנַח־.

In other stems, the נ is retained as the third radical, e. g. יָנַח־, cf. h § 19 c and § 44 n. On the entirely anomalous aphaeresis of the *Nûn* with a strong vowel in יָנַח־ (for יָנַח־) 2 S 22⁴¹, cf. § 19 i.—On the *passive imperfect* יָנַח־, cf. § 53 u.

§ 67. *Verbs y"y*, e. g. סָבַב to surround.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 155 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 632 ff.

1. A large number of Semitic stems have verbal forms with only *a* two radicals, as well as forms in which the stem has been made triliteral by a *repetition of the second radical*, hence called verbs *y"y*. Forms with two radicals were formerly explained as being due to contraction from original forms with three radicals. It is more correct

¹ P. Haupt on Ju 16⁵ in his Bible, compares the form of the Assyrian imperfect *iddan* or *ittan* (besides *inādin*, *ināmādin*) from *nadānu*=נָתַן. But could this one passage be the only trace left in Hebrew of an imperf. in *a* from נָתַן?

to regard them as representing the original stem (with two radicals), and the forms with the second radical repeated as subsequently developed from the monosyllabic stem.¹ The appearance of a general contraction of trilateral stems is due to the fact that in biliteral forms the second radical regularly receives *Dageš forte* before affirmatives, except in the cases noted in § 22 *b* and *q*. This points, however, not to an actual doubling, but merely to a strengthening of the consonant, giving more body to the monosyllabic stem, and making it approximate more to the character of trilateral forms.

The development of biliteral to trilateral stems (י"ע) generally takes place in the 3rd *sing. masc. and fem.* and 3rd *plur. perfect Qal* of *transitive* verbs, or at any rate of verbs expressing an activity, e.g. קָבַב, קָבְבָהּ, קָבְבִי : קָבַן Gn 33⁵ (but with suffix קָבַנִי, ver. 11); sometimes with an evident distinction between transitive and intransitive forms, as צָרַר to *make strait*, צָר to *be in a strait*; see further details, including the exceptions, in *aa*. The development of the stem takes place (*a*) necessarily whenever the strengthening of the 2nd radical is required by the character of the form (e.g. שָׁדַד, חָלַל), and (*b*) as a rule, whenever the 2nd radical is followed or preceded by an essentially long vowel, as, in *Qal*, קָבַב, קָבִיב, in *Pô'el* and *Pô'al*, סוֹבֵב, סוֹבֵב.

b 2. The biliteral stem always (except in *Hiph'il* and the *imperfect Niph'al*, see below) takes the vowel which would have been required between the *second* and *third* radical of the ordinary strong form, or which stood in the ground-form, since that vowel is characteristic of the form (§ 43 *b*), e.g. תָּמַח answering to קָטַל to the ground-form *qāṭālāt*, תָּמַח to the ground-form *qāṭālū*; *infinitive*, קָטַל to קָטַל.

c 3. The insertion of *Dageš forte* (mentioned under *a*), for the purpose of strengthening the second radical, never takes place (see § 20 *l*) in the final consonant of the word, e.g. תָּמַח, קָטַל, not תָּמַח, קָטַל; but it appears again on the addition of affirmatives or suffixes, e.g. תָּמַחִי, קָטַחִי, &c.

d 4. When the affirmative begins with a consonant (נ, ח), and hence the strongly pronounced second radical would properly come at the end of a closed syllable, a *separating vowel* is inserted between the stem-syllable and the affirmative. In the *perfect* this vowel is *i*, in the *imperative* and *imperfect* '—, e.g. קָטַחִי, קָטַחִי, *imperfect* תָּקַחִי (for *sabb-tā, sabb-nū, tasōbb-nā*). The artificial opening of the syllable

¹ So (partly following Ewald and Böttcher) A. Müller, *ZDMG.* xxxiii. p. 698 ff.; Stade, *Lehrbuch*, § 385 *b, c*; Nöldeke, and more recently Wellhausen, 'Ueber einige Arten schwacher Verba im Hebr.' (*Skizzen u. Vorarb.* vi. 250 ff.). Against Böttcher see M. Lambert, *REJ.* xxxv. 330 ff., and Brockelmann, as above.

by this means is merely intended to make the strengthening of the second radical audible.¹

The *perfect* תָּמַנּוּ (for תָּמַנּוּ) Nu 17²³, ψ 64⁷ (Jer 44¹⁸ תָּמַנּוּ with *Silluq*), owing *e* to omission of the separating vowel, approximates, if the text is right, to the form of verbs ע"ו (cf. תָּמַנּוּ from קוּם).

5. Since the preformatives of the *imperfect Qal*, of the *perfect f* *Niph'al*, and of *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* throughout, before a monosyllabic stem form an open syllable, they take a *long* vowel before the tone (according to § 27 e), e.g. *imperfect Hiph'il* יִסֵּב for *yā-sēb*, *imperative* הִסֵּב for *hā-sēb*, &c. Where the preformatives in the strong verb have *ī*, either the original *ā* (from which the *ī* was attenuated) is retained and lengthened, e.g. יִסֵּב in *imperfect Qal* for *yā-sōb*, or the *ī* itself is lengthened to *ē*, e.g. הִסֵּב *perfect Hiph'il* for *hī-sēb* (see further under *h*). The vowel thus lengthened can be maintained, however, only before the tone (except the *ū* of the *Hoph'al*, הִסֵּב for *hū-sāb*); when the tone is thrown forward it becomes *Šewā*, according to § 27 k (under *ā* and *h* compound *Šewā*), e.g. תָּסֵב, but תִּסְבֶּינָה; *imperfect Hiph'il* תִּסֵּב, but תִּסְבֶּינָה; *perfect* תִּסְבֶּינָה, &c.

Besides the ordinary form of the imperfects, there is another (common in *g* *Aramaic*), in which the *imperfect Qal* is pronounced יִסֵּב or יִסֵּב, the *first* radical, not the second, being strengthened by *Dageš forte*, cf. יִשֵּׁם 1 K 9⁸, וַיִּקְרָה Gn 24²⁶; with *a* in the second syllable, יִקְרָה Lv 11⁷, יִדֵּל Is 17⁴, וַיִּשָּׂא Is 2⁹, &c., יִדֵּם Am 5¹³ and frequently, וַיִּאֲכַל Dt 9²¹, &c., יִסֵּב (turn intrans.) 1 S 5⁸, &c., וַיִּקְרָה Lv 24¹¹, יִדֵּם Ez 47¹², &c., יִחֵם (with *Dageš forte implicitum*) 1 K 1¹; in the plural, יִתְּמוּ Nu 14³⁵, &c. (in pause יִתְּמוּ ψ 102²⁸); perhaps also יִמְלֵ, יִמְדֵ (unless these forms are rather to be referred to *Niph'al*, like יִדְמוּ 1 S 2⁹; יִמְלֵ Jb 24²⁴); with suffix תִּקְבְּנִי occurs (cf. § 10 h) in Nu 23²⁵; *Imperfect Hiph'il* יִתֵּם, *Hoph'al* יִתֵּם, &c. The vowel of the preformative (which before *Dageš* is, of course, short) follows the analogy of the ordinary strong form (cf. also *u* and *y*). The same method is then extended to forms with affirmatives or suffixes, so that even before these additions the second radical is not strengthened, e.g. וַיִּקְדּוּ Gn 43²⁸, &c., for וַיִּקְדּוּ and they bowed the head; וַיִּכְתּוּ and they beat down, Dt 1⁴⁴ (from כָּתַת); וַיִּתְּמוּ Dt 32⁸; יִדְמוּ Ex 15¹⁶, Jb 29²¹ (cf., however, וַיִּסְבּוּ Ju 18²³, 1 S 5⁸, יִכְתּוּ Jer 46⁵, Jb 40²⁰). To the same class of apparently strong formations belongs תִּצְלִינָה (without the separating vowel, for תִּצְלִינָה, cf. 1 S 3¹¹ and below, *p*) they shall tingle, 2 K 21¹², Jer 19³.—On the various forms of the *Niph'al*, see under *t*.

¹ Of all the explanations of these separating vowels the most satisfactory is that of Rüdiger, who, both for the *perfect* and *imperfect* (Ewald and Stade, for the *imperfect* at least), points to the analogy of verbs לָחַץ. We must, however, regard קָבַצוּ as formed on the analogy not of לָחַץ, but (with P. Haupt) of a form גָּלְאוּ (= *gālautā*, cf. Arab. *gāzautā*), while תִּסְבֶּינָה follows the analogy of תִּנְלִינָה. [See also Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, 229 f.]

- h** 6. The original vowel is retained, see *f*, (a) in the preformative of the *imperfect Qal* יָכַב for *yā-sōb* (cf. §§ 47 *b*, 63 *b*, and for verbs עָוַי § 72); (b) in the *perfect Niph'al* נָכַב for *nā-sāb* (§ 51 *a*); (c) in *Hoph'al* הִיכַב, with irregular lengthening (no doubt on the analogy of verbs עָוַי for *hōsāb* from *hū-sab*, *imperfect* יִכַּב from *yū-sab*, &c.
- i** On the other hand, an already attenuated vowel (*i*) underlies the intransitive *imperfects Qal* with *ā* in the second syllable (probably for the sake of dissimilating the two vowels), e.g. יָמַר for *yā-mār* (see *p*); and in the preformative of *Hiph'il* הִיכַב from *hū-sēb* (ground-form הִקְטִיל, § 53 *a*), as well as of the participle מִכַּב (ground-form מִקְטִיל), on the analogy of the perfect. In the second syllable of the Perf. the underlying vowel is *i*, attenuated from an original *ā*, which in the strong verb is abnormally lengthened to *ī* (§ 53 *a*). The *ē* lengthened from *i* is, of course, only tone-long, and hence when without the tone and before *Dageš forte* we have e.g. הִקְבֹּת. On the retention of the original *ā* in the second syllable, cf. *v*.
- k** 7. The *tone*, as a general rule, tends to keep to the stem-syllable, and does not (as in the strong verb) pass to the affirmatives הָיָה, וְ and וְ— (2nd *sing. fem. imperfect*); e.g. 3rd *sing. fem. perfect* הָיָה, in *pause* הָיָה; with ר and gutturals הָרָה (for מָרָה, ψ 44²⁶; on the other hand, with *wāw* consecutive וְרָה Is 6¹² (but וְרָה Ex 1¹⁶). In the 3rd *plur. perfect* the tone-syllable varies; along with הָלֹךְ, קָלֹךְ, we also find דָּלֹךְ and קָלֹךְ Is 59¹², שָׁחֹ Hb 3⁶, &c.; but in *pause* always הָלָכְךָ, קָלָכְךָ, &c. The tone likewise remains on the stem-syllable in the *imperfect Qal* in יָסַב, יָסְבֹּךְ; *perfect Hiph'il* הִסְבֵּךְ, הִסְבֹּךְ; *imperfect* יִסְבֵּךְ, יִסְבֹּךְ, &c. In the forms with separating vowels, the tone is moved forward to these vowels (or to the final syllable, cf. *ee*), e.g. סָבֹתָ, יִסְבֵּינָה, &c.; except before the endings תָּם and תֵּן in the *perfect*, which always bear the tone. This shifting of the tone naturally causes the shortening of the merely tone-long vowels *ē* and *ō* to *i* and *u* (or *ö*, see *n*), hence הִקְבֹּת from הִכַּב, יִסְבֵּינָה from יָסַב; on cases in which the vowel of the preformative becomes *Šewā*, see above, *f*.
- l** 8. In several verbs עָוַי, instead of *Pi'el*, *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el*, the less frequent conjugation *Pō'el*, with its passive and reflexive, occurs (most probably on the analogy of the corresponding forms of verbs עָוַי, cf. § 72 *m*), generally with the same meaning,¹ e.g. עוֹלֵל to *ill-treat*, passive עוֹלָל, reflexive הִתְעוֹלֵל (from עָלַל; cf. the *Hithpō'el* from רָעַע

¹ Sometimes both *Pi'el* and *Pō'el* are formed from the same stem, though with a difference of meaning, e.g. רָצַץ to *break in pieces*, רָצַץ to *oppress*; הִנֵּן to *make pleasing*, הִנֵּן to *have pity*; סָבַב to *turn*, to *change*, סוֹבֵב to *go round*, to *encompass*.

and פָּרַר Is 24^{19 f.}); in a few verbs also *Pilpēl* (§ 55 f) is found, e. g. הִתְפַּלֵּל to roll, *Hithpalpēl* הִתְפַּלֵּל to roll oneself (from הָלַל); imperative with suffix הִלְלֵהָ exalt her, Pr 4⁸; שִׂעֲשַׁע to comfort, to delight in; passive שִׁעֲשַׁע to be caressed (from שָׁעַע). These forms cannot appear in a biliteral form any more than *Piēl*, *Pu'al*, and *Hithpa'ēl*.—For הִתְפַּרֵּר 2 S 22²⁷ read, according to ψ 18²⁷, הִתְפַּרֵּר.

REMARKS.

I. On Qal.

1. In the *perfect*, isolated examples are found with *ō* in the first syllable, *m* which it is customary to refer to triliteral stems with middle *ō* (like יָכַל, § 43 a); viz. רָמוּ they are exalted, Jb 24²⁴ to רָמוּ they shot, Gn 49²³ to רָבּוּ; וָרָ Is 1⁶ to וָרָר. But this explanation is very doubtful: וָרָ especially is rather to be classed among the passives of Qal mentioned in § 52 e.

2. *Imperfects* Qal with *ō* in the second syllable keep the original *a* in the *preformative*, but lengthen it to *ā*, as being in an open syllable, hence יָחַן, יָמַר, יָעַן, יָרַן, יָרַע (trans. he breaks in pieces, but יָרַע intrans. = he is evil); imperfects with *ā* have, in the *preformative*, an *ē*, lengthened from *ī*. See the examples below, under *p*, § 63 c and *e*, § 72 h, and specially Barth in ZDMG. 1894, p. 5 f.

The *Hölēm* of the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* (יָכַח, יָכַח) is only tone-long, and therefore, as a rule, is written defectively (with a few exceptions, chiefly in the later orthography, e. g. צֹר bind up, Is 8¹⁶; גֹּל ψ 37⁵; דָּוָם ver. 7; לָבֹז לָבֹז to plunder, Est 3¹³, 8¹¹). When this *ō* loses the tone, it becomes in the final syllable *ō*, in a sharpened syllable *ū*, or not infrequently even *ö* (see above, *k*). Examples of *ö* are: (a) in a toneless final syllable, i. e. before *Maqqeph* or in the *imperfect consecutive*, רָן (rōn) to rejoice, Jb 38⁷; וָסַב Ju 11¹⁸ (once even with *ū* in a toneless final syllable, וָרַם Ex 16²⁰); on the other hand, in the *plur.* וּסְבִי, fem. וְתַסְבִּי; (b) before a tone-bearing *affirmative* or *suffix*, e. g. *imperative 2nd sing. fem.* רָפִי, רָפִי (cf. *f*); חַנְּנִי pity me; סָלְוָה Jer 50²⁶; יִשְׁרָם Pr 11³ Qeré; תַּחֲנֶה Ex 12¹⁴ (for the defective writing, cf. יִסְפְּהוּ Jb 40²²). In יַחֲנֶה Gn 43²⁹, Is 30¹⁹ (for יַחֲנֶה) this *ö* is thrown back to the *preformative*.

On the 2nd plur. fem. imperat. עֲרֶה make yourselves naked Is 32¹¹, cf. the *O* analogous forms in § 48 i.—Quite abnormal is the *infinitive absolute* רָעָה Is 24¹³ (as ה follows, probably only a case of dittography for רָעַע, cf. קָב Nu 23²⁵ and שָׁל Ru 2¹⁶); so also are the *imperatives* קַבְּהֵלִי Nu 22^{11, 17}, and אֲרֶה־לִּי 22⁶, 23⁷, with ה *paragogic*. We should expect קַבְּהֵ, אֲרֶה. If these forms are to be read qūballi, 'āralli, they would be analogous to such cases as מְפַרֵּה (§ 90 i), the addition of the *paragogic* ה causing no change in the form of the word (קָב like רָן above). If, however, as Jewish tradition requires, they are to be read qāballi, 'āralli, then in both cases the *Qameṣ* must be explained, with

Stade, as the equivalent of \bar{o} (קָבַה־לִּי, &c.; cf. § 9 v). Still more surprising is קָבַנו *curse him*, Nu 23¹³, for קָבַנו or קָב¹.

- p 3. Examples with *Pathah* in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* are בָּר (in לְבָרֵם *to prove them*, Ec 3¹⁸); רַר Is 45¹; שֶׁר Jer 5²⁶; בִּשְׁגָם *in their error*, Gn 6³ (so ed. Mant., but there is also good authority for בִּשְׁגָם, from שֶׁ = שֶׁ = שֶׁ and נָם also; so Baer and Ginsburg). Also גַּל *take away*, ψ 119²²; and the *imperfects* יָחַם *it is hot*, Dt 19⁶, &c. (on the \bar{e} of the preformative cf. n); יָמַר *it is bitter*, Is 24⁹; יָצַר *it is straitened*; יָרַךְ *it is soft*, Is 7⁴; תִּשָּׁם *it is desolate*, Ez 12¹⁹ (in pause תִּשָּׁם Gn 47¹⁹); וַתִּקַּל *she was despised*, Gn 16⁴ (but elsewhere in the *impf. consec.* with the tone on the penultima, e.g. וַיִּצָּר Gn 32⁸, &c.; וַיִּרָע Gn 21¹¹, &c., cf. Ez 19⁷); in the 1st *sing. imperfect* אֵיתָם² ψ 19¹⁴, abnormally written fully for אֵתָם, unless אֵתָם is to be read, as in some MSS., on the analogy of the 3rd *sing.* יֵתָם.—In the *impf. Qal* of שָׁלַל the reading of Hb 2⁸ varies between יִשְׁלֹךְ (Baer, Ginsb.) and יִשְׁלֹךְ (ed. Mant., Jabl.).—The following forms are to be explained with Barth (*ZDMG.* xliii. p. 178) as *imperfects Qal* with original \bar{i} in the second syllable, there being no instances of their *Hiph'il* in the same sense: וַיָּגַל Gn 29¹⁰; יָגַן Is 31⁵, &c.; וַיִּסַּךְ Ex 4c²¹, ψ 91⁴, &c.; perhaps also הִצְעִיכָה 1 S 3¹¹ and יָהַל Jb 31²⁶, &c.; in accordance with this last form, בָּהַל (בְּ) Jb 29³ would also be an *infinitive Qal*, not *Hiph'il* (for בְּהַלּוֹ), as formerly explained below, under *w*. Finally the very peculiar form וַתִּרְצַן Ju 9⁵³ may probably be added to the list.

- q Imperfects, with an original \bar{u} in the second syllable, are also found with this \bar{u} lengthened to \bar{u} (instead of \bar{o}), e.g. יָרוּן, if the text is correct, in Pr 29⁶; יָשׁוּר ψ 91⁶ (unless it be simply an imperfect from יָשׁוּר *to be powerful, to prevail*); יָרוּן (if from רָצַן Is 42⁴, &c. (also defectively אָרַן ψ 18³⁰; but in Ec 12⁶, according to Baer, וַתִּרְצַן; וַתִּרְצַן Ez 24¹¹ (on the sharpening of the ת cf. *g* above)).³

- r A similar analogy with verbs ע"ו is seen in the *infinitives* לָבוּר (for בָּר Ec 9¹; בָּחֲקוּ Pr 8²⁷ (cf. בָּחֲקוּ Pr 8²⁹) for בָּחֲקוּ, and in the *imperfect* אֲמַשֶּׁךְ Gn 27²¹. (The forms חָלוּת in ψ 77¹⁰, שָׁמוּת Ez 36⁸, חָלוּתִי ψ 77¹¹, formerly treated here as *infinitives* from ע"ו stems, are rather to be referred to ל"ה stems, with Barth, *Wurzeluntersuchungen*, Lpz. 1902, p. 21.) On other similar cases, see below, under *ee*. For examples of the *aramaizing imperfect*, see above, *g*.

- s 4. In the *participle*, the *aramaizing* form שֶׁסִּסִּיךְ for שֶׁסִּסִּיךְ occurs in K^{ethibh}, Jer 30¹⁶ (the Q^{ere} indicates a *participle* from שָׁסַךְ); רָעָה Pr 25¹⁹ appears to be a contraction from רָעָעָה, *part. fem.* = *breaking in pieces*.

¹ For נו as suffix of the 3rd person a parallel might be found in יִשְׁנֹו, § 100 o, and probably also in the *Nūn* of the Phoenician suffix נם: cf. Barth, *ZDMG.* xli. p. 643, and the note on § 100 o.

² Also in Ez 6⁶, instead of תִּשְׁמָנָה, which could only come from יִשָּׁם, יִשָּׁם is intended, and תִּשְׁמָנָה in the same verse is probably only an error for יִשְׁמָנָה.

³ According to Stade, *Grammatik*, § 95, Rem., the pronunciation with \bar{u} , since it also appears in Neo-Punic [and in Western Syriac, see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, § 48], was that of everyday life.

II. On *Niph'al*.

5. Besides the ordinary form of the perfect נָסַב with *Pathah* (in pause תָּנַסַב) and the participle נֹסֵב with *Qameṣ* in the second syllable, there is also another with *Sere*, and a third with *Holem*, e.g. perfect נָמַם *it melts*, Ez 21¹², 22¹⁵; נָסַבָּה (for נִסְבָּה) Ez 26²; *part.* נֹמֵם *molten*, 1 S 15⁹, Na 2¹¹; נָקַל *it is a light thing*, 2 K 20¹⁰, Is 49⁶ (*perf.* נִקַּל); with *ō*, e.g. נָקְלוּ *they are rolled together*, Is 34⁴; cf. 63¹⁹, 64², Am 3¹¹, Na 1¹², Ec 12^{6b}. In the imperfect with *ō* in the second syllable, on the analogy of verbs ע"ו (from which König would also explain the perfects with *ō*), we find תִּרְמִי *thou shalt be brought to silence*, Jer 48² (unless this form should be referred to *Qal* with *Qimḥi*, Olshausen, König); יִרְעַע *he suffers hurt*, Pr 11¹⁵, 13²⁰; תִּרְוִץ (for *tirrōṣ*) Ez 29⁷; with *ē* in the second syllable תִּחַל *she profanes herself*, Lv 21⁹, but וַיִּחַל Ez 22²⁶, and יִחַל Is 48¹¹, יִחַת Is 7⁸, &c. For infinitives, cf. הָמַם *to melt*, ψ 68³ (as *inf. constr.*; 2 S 17¹⁰ as *inf. absol.*); again, with compensatory lengthening in the first syllable, הִחַל Ez 20⁹, 14²², but with suffix הִחִלּוּ Lv 21⁴; also הִבּוּז *to be plundered*, and הִבּוֹק *to be emptied*, Is 24³; in the imperative, only הִפְרוּ *be ye clean*, Is 52¹¹. On הִרְמוּ *get you up*, Nu 17¹⁰, and the corresponding imperf. יִרְמוּ Ez 10¹⁷, &c., cf. 72 *dā*.

Examples of the perfect *Niph'al* with sharpening of the initial syllable are, וַיִּחַל *it is profaned*, Ez 22¹⁶; 25³ (from וַיִּחַל); נָחַר (from נָחַר) ψ 69⁴, 102⁴ (also נָחַר Jer 6²⁹); נָחַת *fractus est* (from נָחַת) Mal 2⁵; cf. with this in the participle, נֹחָמִים (for *nihpāmim*) Is 57⁵, and נִנְאָרִים Mal 3⁹: in the imperative and infinitive *Niph'al* such a virtual strengthening of the guttural after preformatives never occurs.—The occurrence of *u* instead of *ō* as a separating vowel in the perfect נִשְׁדָּנוּ Mic 2⁴ is abnormal.

III. On *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

6. The second syllable in *Hiph'il* sometimes has *Pathah* instead of *Sere*, especially under the influence of ר and the gutturals, e.g. perfect הִמַּר *he made bitter*, הִשָּׁח *he bowed*, הִפַּר *he hath broken*, Gn 17¹⁴, in pause, cf. § 29 *q*; otherwise הִפַּר, plur. הִפְרוּ Is 24⁵. In הִפִּיר ψ 33¹⁰, Ez 17¹⁹, cf. ψ 89³⁴, and in הִשִּׁיר Ho 8⁴ (perhaps also in הִיתִן Hab 2¹⁷, but cf. § 20 *n*) there is an assimilation to the corresponding forms of verbs ע"ו, see *z*. Also הִצַּר Dt 28⁵², הִתּוּ (in pause) Is 18⁵; *inf.* לְהַבֵּר *to cleanse*, Jer 4¹¹, in pause. But also with other consonants, e.g. הִרַק 2 K 23¹⁵, הִקַּל Is 8²³; הִרַךְ Jb 23¹⁶; plur. הִרְסוּ 1 S 5^{9.10} (and so usually in the 3rd plur. *perf.*, except before ר and gutturals, e.g. הִרְעוּ); *imper.* הִשָּׁע *besmear*, Is 6¹⁰; plur. הִשְׁמוּ *be astonished*, Jb 21⁵; imperfect תִּרְעַע *Thou dost afflict*; *part.* מִצַּל (on *ē* in the first syllable, see under *i*) *shadowing*, Ez 31³ (but מִסִּיד Ju 3²⁴ is assimilated to the form of verbs ע"ו, unless, with Moore, we simply read מִסִּיד, or, with incorrect spelling, מִסִּיד). So in the imperative הִמְיִשְׁנִי Ju 16²⁶ *Qerē*, and in the infinitive הִתְחַמֵּךְ Is 33¹).

The *ē* of the second syllable, when without the tone, may become *ē*, e.g. הִחַל Gn 31⁷ (see also *x*). It is unusual (cf. § 53 *k*) to find the *ē* written fully as in the infinitive לְהִפְרִי Zc 11¹⁰. Instead of *Hateph-Pathah* a *Hateph-*

S^eghôl is found under the preformative in הִקְלַתְנִי 2 S 19⁴⁴, and a *Pathah* occurs before ה (with a virtual sharpening of the ה) in such forms as הִחַתְתָּ Is 9³; cf. Gn 11⁶, Dt 2³¹, 3²⁴, 1 S 22¹⁵, Est 6¹³—in all these cases before ה.—On בָּהֶלֶךְ Jb 29³, see above, *p*: on וְהִחַתְתִּי Jer 49³⁷, see below, *dd*.

a' 7. In the *imperfect consecutive* of verbs whose second radical is a guttural, *ā* is retained (§ 22 *d*) in the second syllable instead of *ê*, e.g. וַיִּרַע 1 K 16²⁵: so also with ר, as וַיִּצַר 2 Ch 28²⁰, Dt 2⁹—but cf. also וַיִּפֹּר Neh 4⁹.

y 8. Aramaizing forms (but cf. Rem. to § 67 *g*) in *Hiph'ûl* and *Hoph'al* are, וַיִּסֹּב Ex 13¹⁸, &c.; cf. Ju. 18²³; אֶל-תִּמְרָן Ex 23²¹, but read אֶל-תִּמְרָן from מְרָה: וַיִּכְתֶּה Dt 1⁴⁴ (cf. Nu 14⁴⁵), but וַיִּסְבּוּ Ju 18²³, 1 S 5⁸, 2 Ch 29⁶; אֶחָל *profanabo*, Ez 39⁷; וַיִּהְיֶה Jb 22³; without elision of the ה (cf. § 53 *q*), וַיִּהְיֶה 1 K 18²⁷, but Jer 9⁴ וַיִּהְיֶה, Jb 13⁹ וַיִּהְיֶה; with *i* in the second syllable וַיִּשִׁים Jer 49²⁰, 50⁴⁵; cf. וַיִּשִׁים Nu 21³⁰; in the *perfect* הוֹיִלָּה La 1⁸. In *Hoph'al*, הִפְכוּ they are brought low, Jb 24²¹; יִכּוּ he is smitten, Is 24¹² (*plur.* יִכְתּוּ Jer 46⁵, Mi 1⁷); in *pause*, יִחָקוּ Jb 19²³, but also יִכְתּוּ Jb 4²⁰ (so Baer, Ginsb., but ed. Mant., Jabl. *יִכְתּוּ*); with *ô* in the initial syllable, הִשְׁמָה (*infinitive with suffix* = הִשְׁמָה, cf. § 91 *e*) Lv 26³⁴, cf. 2 Ch 36²¹; בִּהְשָׁמָה, with irregular syncope for בִּהְשָׁמָה, Lv 26⁴³.

IV. In General.

z 9. Verbs ע"ע are most closely related as regards inflexion to verbs ע"ו (§ 72). The form of verbs ע"ע is generally the shorter (cf. e.g. יָכַח and יָקוּם, יָחַס and יָקוּם); in a few cases, however, the two classes exactly coincide, e.g. in the *imperfect Qal* and *Hiph'ûl* with *wāw* consecutive, in *Hoph'al* and in the less common conjugations (see above, *i*).

aa 10. The developed forms (with three radicals), as mentioned in *a*, are especially frequent in the 3rd *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, and the 3rd *plur. perf. Qal* (i.e. in forms without an affirmative or with an affirmative beginning with a vowel) of transitive verbs, or verbs, at any rate, expressing action, e.g. סָבַב, שָׁדוּנִי, סָבַבְנִי, סָבַבְתִּי, &c. Sometimes the contracted, as well as the uncontracted form, is found, e.g. בָּזָז to plunder, *plur.* בָּזְזוּ; in other parts, only בָּזְזוּ Dt 2³⁵, as well as בָּזְזוּ Dt 3⁷; וַיִּמְמָתוּ Zc 8^{14,15} and וַיִּמְמָתוּ Jer 4²⁸. Other examples of biliteral forms in 2nd *sing. masc.* are Dt 25¹², Pr 30³²; in 1st *sing.*, Jos 5⁹. Apart from *Qal* the only example of a developed form is וַיִּהְיֶה Jer 49³⁷.

bb On the other hand, the biliteral forms are the more common in the 3rd *sing.* and *plur.* of perfects which are *intransitive*, and express a state; cf. דָּק Dt 9²¹ (Ex 32²⁰ דָּק; elsewhere always a transitive verb); חָת, *fem.* חָתָה; מָר, *fem.* מָרָה (for *marrā*); צָר, *fem.* צָרָה (cf. וְחָרָה Ez 24¹¹); שָׁח, *fem.* שָׁחָה; תָּם, &c.; *plur.* חָתוּ, תָּמוּ, &c. (but on the tone, cf. *ee* below). Exception, עָשָׂה ψ 6⁸.

cc The *intransitive* but developed perfects דָּלָל (also דָּלַל, נָדָדָה, חָלַל, נָדָדָה) (in *pause* נָדָדָה, סָרָה, עָשָׂה, *plur.* in *pause* עָשְׂשׂוּ ψ 31¹¹), צָלַל, נָשְׁחָה, צָלְלוּ (also נָשְׁחָה), almost all have, as Mayer Lambert observes, at least an active, not a stative meaning. Triliteral forms of the *infinitive* after ל are לִסְכַּב Nu 21⁴; לִשְׁדוֹר Jer 47⁴; לָזוּ Gn 31¹⁹ (also לָזוּ Gn 38¹³); cf. also לָחֵם Is 47¹⁴, in *subordinate pause*, for לָחֵם; with *suffix* לִחְנֹנֶכֶם Is 30¹³, and, from the same

form הָנִן , with retraction and modification of the vowel, לְהַנִּיחַ ψ 102¹⁴; also שָׁחוּחַ Is 60¹⁴, בָּנִזוּ 1 S 25², בָּמָסַם Is 10¹⁸, בָּעִזּוּ Pr 8²⁸, בָּצָרוּר Pr 26⁸.—*Imperative* שִׁדְּרִי Jer 49²⁸ (cf. § 20 *b*, and *ibid.* also on הִנְנִי ψ 9¹⁴); in the *imperfect*, יִדְּרִי Na 3⁷ (ψ 68¹³; cf. Gn 31⁴⁰) from נָדַר ; the strong form here, after the assimilation of the *Nûn*, was unavoidable. On the other hand, יִשְׁדְּרִם Jer 5⁶ is anomalous for יִשְׁדֵּם (Pr 11³ *Qerê*; the eastern school read the *Po'el* יִשְׁוֹדְרִם in the *Kethibh*); the strengthening of the second radical has been afterwards resolved by the insertion of a vocal *Šewâ*. Cf. also יִחַן Am 5¹⁵ (elsewhere יָחַן). In *Niph'al*, the triliteral form יִלְבֹּב is found, Jb 11¹²; in *Hiph'il*, all the forms of רָנַן , thus *imperative* הִרְנִינִי , *imperfect* תִּרְנִין , *infinitive* הִשְׁמִם Mi 6¹³; *participle* מִשְׁמִים Ez 3¹⁵. That the developed (triliteral) forms possess a certain emphasis is seen from their frequent use in *pause*, as in ψ 118¹¹ after a biliteral form ($\text{כַּפְּנִי גַם-סִכְכְּבִנִי}$).

11. The above-mentioned (see *g*) neglect of the strengthening in aramaizing forms, such as יָדְמוּ and the like, occurs elsewhere tolerably often; in the *perfect Qal* תָּמְנוּ for תַּמְנוּ Nu 17²⁸ (Jer 44¹⁸; cf. above, *e*); *imperfect* נָבְּוּ 1 S 14³⁰ (הָ *parag.* without any influence on the form, cf. *o*); even with the firm vowel reduced to vocal *Šewâ*; נָבְּלָה Gn 11⁷ for נִבְּלָה (cohortative from פָּלַל); יָזְמוּ for יִזְמוּ *ibid.* ver. 6, *they purpose*; following the analogy of verbs עָזְמוּ (see above, *r*); from *intransitive imperfects Qal*, תִּצְרִי Is 49¹² (*plur. masc.* Jb 18⁷); יִרְעִי Neh 2³; also תִּישְׁמְנָה Ez 6⁶ (for which read תִּישְׁנָה = תִּישְׁנָה) might be explained in the same way.—*Perfect Niph'al* נִסְכָּה for נִסְכָּה Ez 41⁷; נָזְלוּ Ju 5⁵ for נִזְלוּ ; נִמְלָתָם for נִמְלָתָם Gn 17¹¹ (as if from מָלַל not מָוַל to *circumcise*), cf. Is 19³, Jer 8¹⁴; *imperfect* תִּמְקֶנָּה Zc 14¹²; *participle* נִחְמִים , cf. *u*. So also נָפַץ 1 S 13¹¹, נִפְצָה Gn 9¹⁹ (cf. Is 33³), are *perfects Niph'al* from פָּצַץ (= פָּוַץ), not *Qal* from נָפַץ .—In *Hiph'il* הִתְלַחַת (for הִתְלַחַת) Ju 16¹⁰ (2 S 15³⁴); הִעָנָה for הִעָנָה Pr 7¹³ (cf. Ct 6¹¹, 7¹³).

No less irregular is the suppression of the vowel of the stem-syllable in לְהַפְרִיחַ Lv 26¹⁵.—On the *perfect* דָּלִיּוּ Pr 26⁷, cf. § 75 *u*.

12. Cases in which the tone is thrown forward on the affirmatives (see *cc* *k*) are (*a*) in the *perfect*, the 1st *sing.* regularly (but cf. וְהִצְרִיתִי Jer 10¹⁸ before לָהֶם) after 1 *consec.*, Ex 33^{19,22}, 2 K 19³⁴, &c., also Is 44¹⁶ (חַמּוּתִי before רִי); ψ 92¹¹ (but the text is certainly corrupt; see the *Lexicon*), 116⁶, perhaps also Jb 19¹⁷, וְחַזַּתִּי (though in this passage, and in ψ 17³, the form might be an *infinitive* in *ôth*; see Delitzsch on Jb 19¹⁷); in the 2nd *sing.* וְקִצְתָּהּ (before אֵ) Dt 25¹³; in the 3rd *plural*, רַבְּרֵי *multi sunt*, ψ 3², 104²⁴, Jer 5⁶, 1 S 25¹⁰; רַבְּנֵי *they are soft*, ψ 55²² קִלְרֵי *they are swift*, Jer 4¹³, Hb 1⁸; נִזְכָּרֵי *they are pure*, Jb 15¹⁵, 25⁵, La 4⁷; שָׁחוּ *they did bow*, Hb 3⁶; חָרְוּ *they are burned*, Is 24⁶. A by-form of שָׁחוּ (עָוִי , cf. § 72 *dd*) is שָׁחִיו ψ 49¹⁵, 73⁹.

(*b*) In the *imperative* (a command in an emphatic tone) רָפִי *sing.*, Is 54¹, *ff* Zp 3¹⁴, Zc 2¹⁴; רָנִי Is 44²³, 49¹³, Jer 31⁷ (but רָנִי *lament*, La 2¹⁹), חָזִי *keep (thy feasts)*, Na 2¹, Jer 7²⁹; עֲזִיבָהּ (= עֲזָבָהּ) before אֵ , ψ 68²⁹. On the retention of the short vowels \ddot{u} (\ddot{o}) and \ddot{i} before *Dageš forte*, in place of the tone-long \bar{o} and \bar{e} , see above, *k*; on the change of the vowel of the preformative into *Šewâ*, when it no longer stands before the tone, see *g*.

THE WEAKEST VERBS (*Verba Quiescentia*).

§ 68. Verbs נ"פ e.g. אָכַל to eat.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 140 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 589 ff.

- a* So far as ׀ retains its full consonantal value as a guttural, these verbs share all the peculiarities of verbs *primae gutturalis*, mentioned in § 63. They are, however, to be treated as *weak* verbs, when the ׀ loses its value as a consonant, and coalesces with the preceding vowel (originally short) to form one long syllable. This takes place only in the following very common verbs and forms, as if through phonetic decay:—
- b* 1. In the *imperfect Qal*, five verbs (viz. אָבַד to perish, אָבָה to be willing, אָכַל to eat, אָמַר to say, אָפָה to bake) regularly make the נ quiesce in a long *ô*, e.g. יֹאכֵל.¹ In a few others the ordinary (strong) form is also in use, as יֹאחֹז (18 times) and יֹאחֹז (3 times) he takes hold; יִקַּח (see *h*), also יֹאסֵף, he collects. This *ô* has primarily arisen from an obscuring of *â* (§ 9 q), and the *â* from נָ—, the weak consonant נ coalescing with *â* to *â*; cf. § 23 a.
- c* In the second syllable *ô* (for original *ũ*) never appears, but either *ē*² or *ă*; and in *pause* almost always *ē*, even before the tone-bearing heavy affirmative וַי, e.g. יֹאכְלוּ Dt 18¹, without the pause יֹאכְלוּ Dt 4²⁸. In the 3rd *sing. masc.* and 1st *sing.* of אָמַר, however, *ă* is always retained in *pause*, יֹאמֶר and אֶמַר; but in the 2nd *masc.* תֹּאמֶר 1 K 5²⁰, in the 3rd *fem.* תֹּאמְרִי Pr 1²¹; in the *plural* יֹאמְרוּ Jer 5², ψ 145^{6,11}, תֹּאמְרוּ Jer 23²⁸, with *Segolta*; cf. also תֹּאכְלִי 1 S 17, &c. But with conjunctive accents in the body of the sentence, *ă* (as being a lighter vowel) is used, e.g. תֹּאכְדֵּךְ לְעֵד ψ 9¹⁹, but in *pause* תֹּאכְדֵּךְ ψ 1⁶; cf. a similar interchange of *ē* and *ă* in § 65 c. The 3rd *fem. plur. impf.* always has the form תֹּאכְלִנָּה Zc 11⁹.
- d* When the tone moves back, the final syllable of the *imperfects* of אָבַד and אָכַל, with a conjunctive accent, also always takes *Pathah*, e.g. יֹאבֵד Jb 3³, יֹאכֵל and he did eat; in אָמַר the loss of the tone from the final syllable only occurs in the form with *wāw* consecutive

¹ So in the modern vulgar Arabic of South Palestine, *ya'kul* (he eats) becomes *yôkul*.

² On this *ē* (originally *î*) as a dissimilation from *ô* (originally *ũ*), cf. § 27 w, and F. Philippi, in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, xiv. 178. The latter rightly observes that the existence of an original *u* in the *imperfect* of אָכַל is indicated by the form of the *imperative* אֲכַל, the Arabic *ya'kul* and the Aramaic יֹאכֵל, as well as by the fact that יֹאחֹז and יֹאסֵף are found along with יֹאחֹז and יֹאסֵף.

(but never in the 1st *sing.* וַאֲמַר; cf. וַאֲכַל), and then the final syllable, if without the *pause*, always takes *Seghôl*, וַיֹּאמֶר and he said (except לוֹ וַתֹּאמֶר Pr 7¹³).

In *pause*, however, the *imperfect consecutive* (except the 1st pers. of אָכַל, see below) always has the form וַיֹּאכַל (but *plur.* always יֹאכְלוּ, וַיֹּאכְלוּ, וַיֹּאמְרוּ; except וַיֹּאמֶר in the poetic portion of the book of Job, as 3², 4¹, &c., but not in 32⁶, in the middle of the verse. The weak *imperfect* of אָחַז is always יֹאחֲזִי and וַיֹּאחֲזִי, but in the 1st *sing.*, according to § 49 e, וַיֹּאחֲזִי Ju 20⁶; cf. וַיֹּאכַל Gn. 3^{12,13} in *pause*.—אָפָה and אָפָה are, at the same time, verbs ל"ה, hence *imperfect* יֹאפֶה (§ 75 c).

Before *light* suffixes the vowel of the second syllable becomes vocal Šewâ, as אֶכְלֵם, but תֹּאכְלֵם.—In a few cases, instead of the ô in the first syllable an é is found, which is due to contraction from the group $\overline{v_i} \overline{v_i}$ (or $\overline{v_i}$) in place of $\overline{v_i}$; e.g. תֹּאֲתָה it shall come, Mi 4⁸, from תֹּאֲתָה (from תֹּאֲתָה); אֶהֱבֵ (for אֶהֱבֵ) I love, Pr 8¹⁷, also (four times) אֶהֱבֵ Mal 1², &c., with suffixes אֶהֱבֵהוּ Ho 11¹, 14⁵, &c. (but only in 1st *sing.*, otherwise יֹאֲהֵב, &c., from אֶהֱבֵ, אֶהֱבֵ); וַיֹּאחֲזֵר and I stayed, Gn 32⁶. The *infinitive construct* of אָמַר with לִי is always לֹאמַר *dicendo*, for לֹאמַר.—According to Barth (ZDMG. 1889, p. 179) וַיֹּאצֵּל Nu 11²⁵ is to be regarded as an *imperfect Qal*, without the obscuring of אֶ to ô, not as *imperfect Hiph'il*, since אֶצֵּל elsewhere occurs only in the *perfect Qal* and *Niph'al*; on the original *i* in the second syllable, see above, § 67 p. For תֹּאכְלֵהוּ Jb 20²⁶ we should simply emend 'תֹּאכְלֵ; the view that it is *imperfect Pô'el* (which nowhere else occurs) can, as regards the change of ô to ô, be supported only by the very doubtful analogies of ψ 62⁴ (see § 52 q) and ψ 101⁵ Qerê (see § 55 ô), while the view that it is *Pi'el* ('תֹּאכְלֵ = 'תֹּאכְלֵ = 'תֹּאכְלֵ) rests on no analogy whatever. It would be more admissible to suppose that 'תֹּאכְלֵ stands for 'תֹּאכְלֵ, Pu'al (cf. אֶכְלֵ for אֶכְלֵ, § 27 q); but no reason has been discovered for this departure from the natural punctuation 'תֹּאכְלֵ.

2. In the 1st *pers. sing. imperfect*, where two א's would ordinarily come together, the second (which is radical) is regularly dropped (§ 23 f), as אֶמַר¹ (for אֶאמַר), &c., and even *plene* וַיֹּאמֶר Neh 2⁷, &c., אֶזְמַרָה ψ 42¹⁰. In the other cases, also, where the א is ordinarily regarded as *quiescing* in ô or ê, it is only retained orthographically, and on etymological grounds. Hence the possibility of its being dropped in the following cases:—

Always in the contracted forms of אָסַף, as אֶסַף for אֶאסַף ψ 104²⁹; יֹסֵף h 2 S 6¹ (but for יֹאסַף Jb 27¹⁹ read יֹאסַף = יֹסֵף with the LXX); cf. also in

¹ The regularity of this orthography indicates that the contraction of אֶא to á in this 1st pers. occurred at a time when in the 3rd and 2nd persons the א was still audible as a consonant (which accordingly was almost always retained in writing). Nöldeke (ZDMG. xxxii. 593) infers this from the fact that also in Arabic the 3rd and 2nd persons are still written *yā'kulū*, *ū'kulū*, but the 1st pers. 'ákulū, not 'á'kulū.

the 1st pers. Mi 4⁶ and אִסְפַּךְ I S 15⁶, which is apparently (from the *Metheg* with the *i*), intended for an *imperfect Hiph'il*; instead of it, however, read, with the Mantua edition, אִסְפַּךְ (with *i*, according to § 60 f). But תִּאֲסַפֵּן Ex 5⁷ (for תִּאֲסַף, תִּאֲסַף I S 18²⁹ (for תִּאֲסַף), and יִאֲסַף Jb 27¹⁹ (see above) are due to a mistake, since all three forms must be derived from the stem יִסַּף. Furthermore, יִמְרוֹךְ ψ 139²⁰ (where certainly יִמְרִ is to be read); הִבֵּא Pr 1¹⁰ (cf. § 75 *hh*); וַתִּהְיֶה I S 28²⁴; וַיִּזְכְּלוּ Ex 42⁵; וַיִּמְרוּ 2 S 19¹⁴; וַתִּחַן 2 S 20⁹; תִּחַלְתְּ thou gaddest about (from אָחַל, Jer 2³⁶; וַיִּתֵּא Dt 33²¹ (for וַיִּתֵּא), according to other readings (on the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 75 p) וַיִּתֵּא, וַיִּתֵּא or וַיִּתֵּא.

Paradigm I shows the weak forms of the *imperfect Qal*, and merely indicates the other conjugations, which are regular.

- i Rem. 1. In the derived conjugations only isolated weak forms occur: *Perfect Niphal* נִאֲחֲזוּ Nu 32³⁰, Jos 22⁹; *Hiph.* וַיִּאֲצֹל Nu 11²⁵ (but the statement in verse 17 is וַיִּאֲצֹלְתִי, therefore *Qal*); equally doubtful is the punctuation of וַיִּרְבַּ (for וַיִּרְאֵב?) and he laid wait, I S 15⁵, and אָזִין I listen, Jb 32¹¹ (on the analogy of verbs עָזַר); cf. also אוֹכִיל (δ from á) I give to eat, Hos 11⁴; אֲבִידָה (δ from á) I will destroy, Jer 46⁸; וַיִּזְחַר 2 S 20⁵ *Qerê* (for וַיִּזְחַר); the *Kethibh* appears to require the *Pi'el* וַיִּזְחַר, from יָחַר as a secondary form of אָחַר; but וַיִּזְחַר = וַיִּזְחַר for וַיִּזְחַר as *imperfect Qal* is not impossible. On וַאֲזַצְרָה Neh 13¹⁸, cf. § 53 n.—*Infinitive* לְהַכִּיל Ez 21³³ (= לְהַאֲכִי unless it is rather *infin. Hiph.* from פָּוֵל); *Participle* מִזִּין giveth ear, Pr 17⁴ (clearly by false analogy of verbs עָזַר, for מִזִּין); *Imperative* הִרְיִי bring (from אָתָה) Jer 12⁹. (On the same form used for the *perfect* in Is 21¹⁴, cf. § 76 d.)
- k 2. In the *Pi'el* the ׀ is sometimes elided (like ה in יִהְיֶה, יִקְטִיל), thus מִלֵּךְ (as in Aramaic and Samaritan) teaching, for מִלֵּךְ Jb 35¹¹; יִהֵל (if not a mere scribal error) for יִהֵל Is 13²⁰; וַתִּגְדְּלֵנִי thou hast girded me, 2 S 22⁴⁰, for וַתִּגְדְּלֵנִי, as ψ 18⁴⁰; וַאֲבַדְךָ Ez 28¹⁶; cf. § 23 c.

§ 69. Verbs פ"ב. First Class, or Verbs originally פ"ו, e.g. יָשַׁב to dwell.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 141 f.; *Grundriss*, p. 596 ff.

- a Verbs which at present begin with *Yôdh* when without preformatives are divided into two classes according to their origin and consequent inflexion: (a) Verbs which (as still in Arabic and Ethiopic) originally began with *Wāw*, e.g. יָלַד to give birth to, Arab. and Eth. *wālādā*. In consequence of a phonetic change which prevails also with few exceptions in the noun, this *Wāw* in Hebrew and Aramaic always becomes a *Yôdh*, at least when it is the initial consonant; but after preformatives it either reappears, or is again changed into

Yôdh, or, lastly, is altogether elided; (b) Verbs which (as in Arabic) originally began with *Yôdh* (called *Verba cum Iod originario*, see § 70). A few verbs again (some with original *Yôdh*, and some with original *Wāw*) form a special class, which in certain forms assimilates the *Wāw* or *Yôdh* to the following consonant on the analogy of the *Nûn* in verbs פ"י (see § 71).

With regard to verbs פ"י (i. e. פ"י with original *Wāw*) it is to be noticed that—

1. In the *imperfect*, *imperative* and *infinitive construct* *Qal* there is a twofold inflexion, according as the *Wāw* is wholly rejected or only changed into *Yôdh*. The complete rejection (or *elision*) takes place regularly in eight verbs (see *h*) in the following manner:

A. *Imperfect* יִשָּׁב, יִרַע with an unchangeable¹ *Sere* in the first syllable and original *š* in the second, which in the tone-syllable (according to § 27 c) becomes *ē* (thus יִלָּךְ, יִצָּחַק, יִרָד, יִלָּךְ, see *x*), or, under the influence of a guttural, with *ā* in the second (יִרָע, יִחָד, יִחָד).

The tone-long *ē* of the second syllable is of course liable to be shortened or to become *Šēwā*, e. g. יִשְׁבֵּי, יִשְׁבִּי, &c.; in the same way *ā* becomes *Šēwā* in such cases as יִרְעִי, &c., but is lengthened to *Qames* in *pause* (יִרְעִי) and before suffixes (יִרְעִים).

B. *Imperative* שֵׁב with *aphaeresis* of the *Wāw* and with tone-long *ē*, from *š*, as in the *imperfect*.

C. *Infinitive* שֵׁבֶת from original *šibh*, by addition of the feminine ending (ת) lengthened to a *segholate* form; as in verbs פ"י (cf. § 66 b) this lengthening affords a certain compensation for loss of the initial consonant.

Rem. Since the infinitives לָרַח, לָרַח (see below, *m*) point to a ground-form *dī'at*, *līdat*, we must, with Philippi (*ZDMG.* xxxii. 42) and Barth (*ibid.* xli. 606), assign to שֵׁבֶת, &c., the ground-form *šibt* (which, therefore, reappears in שִׁבְתִּי, &c.); the apparent ground-form *šabt* rests upon the law that the *š* of the stem-syllable is changed into *š* whenever the syllable becomes doubly closed by the addition of the vowelless feminine ending.

¹ The *e* of the first syllable is really *ē*, not tone-long *ē*, since it is retained not merely before the tone, and in the counter-tone (e. g. יִרְעִים Ho 14¹⁰), but also in אֶרְעָךְ Ex 33^{13, 17}. It is no objection to this view that the *scriptio plena* of this *ē* occurs (with the exception of יִקָּר ψ 72¹⁴, elsewhere pointed יִקָּר) only in Mi 1⁸ and Ez 35⁹ *Keth.*; in ψ 138⁶ the Masora prefers to point יִרְעִי.—Of the various explanations of the *ē* the most satisfactory is that of Philippi (*ZDMG.* xl. p. 653) that an original *yālid*, for example (see above), became *yīlid* by assimilation of the vowel of the first syllable to that of the second; this then became *yēled* instead of *yēled*, in an attempt to raise the word again in this way (by writing *ē* instead of *e*) to a trilateral form.

d In more than half the number of verbs פ"ו the original *Wāw* in the above-mentioned forms gives place to *Yôdh*, which, unless it suffers aphaeresis (see *f*), appears:—

in the *imperatives* יִרָשׁ, יִצַק and *infinitives* יִרָא, יִסָר, as a strong consonant, but

in the *imperfect* יִרָשׁ, properly *yirāš*, merges with the preceding *š* into *š*.

In the second syllable *imperfects* of this form regularly have *š*.

e (a) That the latter forms are derived from verbs with an original *Wāw* (not *Yôdh*) is shown partly by the inflexion of these verbs in *Niph'al*, *Hiph'il*, and *Hoph'al* (where the original *Wāw* reappears throughout), and partly by the Arabic, in which verbs פ"ו likewise exhibit a twofold formation; cf. *wāladā*, imperf. *yālidu*, with elision of the *Wāw*, and *wāgilā*, *yawgalu*, with retention of the *Wāw*.

f (b) Sometimes both forms, the weaker and the stronger, occur in the same verb; cf. צַק 2 K 4⁴¹ and יִצַק *pour*, Ez 24³ (cf. יִצְקוּ 1 K 18³⁴ and the *infin.* יִצַק Ex 38²⁷); רָשׁ take possession, Dt 1²¹, 1 K 21¹⁵ (but cf. *s*), רָשׁ (in pause for רָשׁ) Dt 24³¹; plur. רָשׁוּ Dt 1⁸, 9²³, but also, with ה־ *paragogic*, יִרָשׁוּ Dt 33²³. In the *imperfect* יִקָר Dt 32²² and יִקָר Is 10¹⁶ it shall be kindled; וַיִּקָר it was precious, 1 S 18³⁰ and יִקָר ψ 49⁹ (cf. יִקָר ψ 72¹⁴).—The form וַיִּחַמוּ Gn 30³⁹, for וַיִּחַמוּ, beside וַיִּחַמְנָה verse 38, is remarkable; cf. § 47 *k*.

g (c) On יָרַד Ju 19¹¹ for יָרַד and נָשַׁב Jer 42¹⁰ for the *infinitive absolute* יִשָּׁב, cf. § 19 *i*.—But יָרַד Ju 5¹³ (twice) is not intended by the Masora either as *perfect* (for יָרַד, which really should be restored) or as *imperative* of יָרַד, but as an apocopated *imperfect Pi'el* from יָרַדְהָ (= יָרַדְהָ) to have dominion.

h (d) The eight verbs,¹ of which the initial consonant in the above-mentioned forms always suffers elision or aphaeresis, are יָלַךְ to bring forth, יָצָא to go forth, יָשַׁב to sit, to dwell, יָרַד to descend, also הֵלַךְ to go (cf. below, *x*); and with *š* in the second syllable of the *imperfect*, יָדַע to know, יָחַד to be united, יָקַע to be dislocated. Examples of the other formation (יִרָשׁ, &c.) are יָעָה to be wearied, יָעַץ to counsel, יָשַׁן to sleep, יָרָא (*imperfect* יִירָא, *imperative* יִירָא) to fear.

i 2. The original *Wāw* is retained as a firm consonant: (a) in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect Niph'al*, being protected by the strengthening, e.g. הַנִּשָּׁב, הַנִּשָּׁב, which are consequently strong forms like הַקָּטַל, הַקָּטַל; (b) in the *Hithpa'el* of some verbs, e.g. הַתְּוֹדַע from יָדַע, הַתְּוֹפֵחַ from יָכַח, הַתְּוֹדָה from יָדָה; otherwise a radical *Wāw* at the beginning of a word is now found only in a few nouns, e.g. וְלָרֹ offspring from יָלַךְ to bear. At the end of a syllable *Wāw* with the homogeneous

¹ A ninth יָסַף to add, is also to be included. In the Mēša'-inscription, l. 21, the *infinitive* is written לִסְפַת (cf. יִסְפַתִּי, l. 29); hence read in Is 30¹ (Nu 32¹⁴, Dt 29¹⁸) סָפַת for סָפַת. The 2nd plur. masc. *imperative* סָפּוּ Is 29¹, Jer 7²¹ corresponds to נִשְׁבּוּ; thus in proof of a supposed סָפַה addere, there remains only אִסְפָה Dt 32²³, for which, according to 2 S 12⁸, read אִסְפָה.

vowel *u* coalesces into *u*; so throughout *Hoph'al*, e.g. הוֹשִׁיב for *hūwšabbh*; but with a preceding *a* the *Wāw* is contracted into *o* (ו); so in the *perfect* and *participle Niph'al* and throughout *Hiph'il*, e.g. נוֹשֵׁב from an original *nāwšābh*, הוֹשִׁיב from an original *hāwšābh*.

The first radical always appears as *Yldh* in the *perfect* and *participle k* *Qal*, יָשַׁב, &c., יָשֵׁב, יֹשֵׁב, even when ו precedes, e.g. וַיֹּשֶׁב (but וַיִּשְׁבָּתָם, according to § 24 *b*), also throughout *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*, e.g. יִחַל to wait, יֵלֵד to be born, and in the *imperfect* and *participle* יִחַל מֵיָדַע known (from יָדַע), and, as a rule, also in *Hithpa'el*, e.g. הִתְיַלֵּד, הִתְיַצַּב, הִתְיַחַש (as against הִתְיָדַע, &c., with *Wāw*).

The beginner may recognize verbs פ"ו in the *imperfect Qal* partly by the *l* *Sere* under the preformatives; in *Niph'al* and *Hiph'il* by the *Wāw* (ו, וי) before the second radical. (The defective writing, as in הוֹלִיד, is rare.) Verbs פ"ו have forms like יָשַׁב (יָדַע), יִשְׁבָּת, in common with verbs פ"ן. Similarly *Hoph'al* has the same form as in verbs ע"ע and ע"ו.

Rem. 1. The *infinitive Qal* of the weaker form (יִשְׁבָּת, ground-form *šibt*, *m* *רָשַׁת*; cf. above, *c*) with suffixes is pointed as יִשְׁבָּתִי¹, רָשַׁתִּי (the strong form only in לִירְשָׁנִי Ju 14¹⁵). The masculine form is very rare, e.g. יָדַע to know, Jb 32^{6,10}, as also the feminine ending הָ, e.g. יָדָעָה² Ex 2⁴, לָדָה Is 37³ (2 K 19³); Jer 13²¹, Ho 9¹¹; מָרָדָה² to descend, Gn 46³, where the change of the *e* into vocal *Šewā* is to be explained, with König, from its position between the principal and secondary tone. From יָדַע, under the influence of the guttural, יָדַעַת is formed, with *suff.* יָדַעַתִּי, &c.; but from יָצַא, יָצַאת. From יָרַד there occurs in ψ 30⁴ in *Qere* מֵיִרְדִּי (the *Keth.* requires מֵיִרְדִּי) a very remarkable case of the strong form (for מֵרְדִּי). For לָת 1 S 4¹⁹ (generally explained as a case of assimilation of ד to ת in the supposed ground-form *ladi*; according to Mayer Lambert pausal of לָת = *ladi*, see above, *c*) read simply לָדַת.

Examples of the strong form of the *infinitive* are יִרָא to fear, Jos 22²⁵, with *n* preposition לִיִּרָא Is 51¹⁶ (but 2 Ch 31⁷ according to Ben Naphtali לִיִּרָא, where the *y* is only retained orthographically, but is really assimilated to the *o*; the reading of Ben Asher, לִיִּסֹר, accepted by Baer, is meaningless); לִישָׁן Ec 5¹¹; לִרָא 1 S 18²⁹ is irregular, but probably לִרָא (for לִירָא) is intended. With *suff.* בִּיסְדִּי Jb 38⁴, cf. Ju 14¹⁵, Ezr 3¹²; with *fem.* יִכָּלַת to be able, Nu 14¹⁶. On יִבְשָׁת, which is likewise usually referred to this class, cf. the note on § 70 *a*.

¹ יִשְׁבָּתִי ψ 23⁶ can hardly be intended for an *infin.* with suffix from יָשַׁב, but rather for a *perf. consec.* from יָשֵׁב; but read יִשְׁבָּתִי.

² The infinitives יָדָעָה and יָרָה belong to the source marked E (Dillmann's B) in the modern criticism of the Pentateuch. The same document also has נָתַן to give, for נָתַת; הָלַךְ to go, for הָלַכַת; and עָשָׂה to make, for עָשִׂוֹת. See Dillmann, *Die BB. Num., Deut., Jos.*, p. 618.

O 2. The *imperative Qal* frequently has the lengthening by הַ, e.g. יִשָּׁהּ *sit thou*, יִרְדָּה *descend thou*. From יָהַב *to give*, Arab. *wāhābā*, only the *imperative* is used in Hebrew; it has the form הַב *give*, lengthened הִבָּה generally with the meaning *age, go to*, hence in Gn 11^{s.4} even addressed to several persons (Gn 29²¹ הִבָּה before אַ to avoid the hiatus); *fem.* הָבִי Ru 3¹⁵, *Mil'era'* on the analogy of the plural הִבְנוּ (once in Jb 6²² הִבְנוּ before the tone-syllable; but cf. Dt 32³), whilst, on the analogy of other *imperatives Qal* of verbs פָּחַדְנוּ, הָבִי, הִבְנוּ would be expected.—On יִדְעָה Pr 24¹⁴, cf. § 48 l.

p 3. The *imperfect* with י elided takes ä in the second syllable, besides the cases mentioned above (under f), also in תִּירַד Jer 13¹⁷ (cf. La 3⁴⁸) and in the pausal form יִלְךָ Jb 27²¹, &c. (from הִלָּךְ, see x); on יִקַּד Is 10¹⁶ see above, f. The ä in the second syllable, when followed by the affirmative נָה (תִּרְנָה &c.), is in accordance with the law mentioned above (under c), by which ä takes the place of i in a doubly closed syllable. Forms with ē in the second syllable shorten the ē to *S^eghôl*, when the tone is drawn back (before a tone-syllable or after *wāw* consecutive), e.g. וְיִשָּׁב Gn 44³³; וְיִרְדָּה; but ē is retained in an open syllable, even with *Mil'el*-tone, in יִצָּא Ex 16²⁹, Ju 9³⁹, in both cases with *nasog 'ahor*, § 29 e. The *pausal* is either of the form וְיִשָּׁב Ru 4¹ or וְיִרְדָּה ψ 18¹⁰; the 1st pers. sing., whether in or out of pause, is וְיִאֲרֶד, וְיִאֲלֶר, &c., except וְיִאֲלָהּ Jb 19¹⁰, see x.—For יִידַע ψ 13⁸ (cf. the note above, on b and the analogous cases in § 70 d) יִידַע is intended.

q The *imperfect* of the form יִירָשׁ is frequently (especially before affirmatives) written defectively, in which case the i can always be recognized as a long vowel by the *Metheg* (see § 16 f), e.g. יִעֲפִי Is 40²⁰, יִנְעֻ Is 65²³; and so always יִרְאוּ *they fear*, as distinguished from יִרְאוּ *they see* (*imperf. Qal* of רָאָה).—On יִיָּשִׁים Gn 50²⁶, 24³³ *Keth.*, and יִיָּסֶף Ex 30³², see § 73 f.

r From יָכַל *to prevail, to be able*, the *imperfect Qal* is יִכָּל, which can only have arisen through a depression of the vowel from יוֹכַל (ground-form *yaukhal* = *yaukhal*), to distinguish it, according to Qimhi, from אוֹכַל, just as, according to § 47 b, אֶקַּטַּל is differentiated from יִקַּטַּל. Cf. the Arabic *yauru'u* (yōru'u) from *waru'a*, *yauḡalu* (yōḡalu) from *waḡila*, as also the vulgar Arabic (among towns-people) *yūṣal*, &c., from *waṣala*. Others regard יוֹכַל as an *imperfect Hoph'al* (*he is enabled* = *he can*), always used instead of the *imperfect Qal*; cf., however, § 53 u.—וְיִתְכַל occurs in Jer 3⁵ as 2nd *sing. fem.* for וְיִתְכַלִּי, according to König because the 2nd *fem.* had been sufficiently indicated previously.—Further יִזְרָה or יִרָה is to be regarded with M. Lambert (*REJ.* xxxvii, no. 73) as *impf. Qal* (not *Hiph'il*) of יָרָה *to throw, shoot* (the supposed *impf. Qal* וְיִזְרִים Nu 21³⁰ is critically very doubtful). This is shown especially by the passages in which the *impf. Qal* יִזְרָה is immediately preceded by the *imperat. Qal* (2 K 13¹⁷) or *infinitive Qal* (ψ 64⁵), or is followed by the *participle Qal* (2 Ch 35²³; but in 2 S 11²⁴ by the *participle Hiph'il*).

S 4. The attenuation of ä to i in the *perfect* (in a toneless, closed syllable) which is discussed in § 44 d (cf. § 64 f) occurs in verbs פָּחַד in a few forms of יָלַד Nu 11¹², Jer 2²⁷, ψ 27, &c. (always after י), as well as of יָרַשׁ, e.g. יִירָשֶׁתִּים, &c., Dt 4¹, 8¹, 17¹¹, 19¹, 26¹, 31³ (always after י for יי). In both cases the attenuation might be explained from the tendency to assimilate the vowels, especially if the initial י was pronounced, as in Syriac, like i (§ 47 b). In the case of יָרַשׁ, however, a secondary form יִרַשׁ (cf. § 44 d) is probably to be assumed, since in Arabic also the verb is *wāriṣā*. The forms

וַיֵּשׁוּב Ez 36¹² and וַיֵּרְשׁוּהָ ψ 69³⁶, &c., are most simply explained from the return of this *z*.

5. As an exception, the *imperfect Niph'al* sometimes has a *y* instead of the *t* ו, e.g. וַיֵּחָל and he stayed, Gn 8¹² (unless the *Piel* or וַיַּחַל, as in ver. 10, is to be read), cf. Ex 19¹³; 1 S 13⁸ *Kethibh*.—The first person always has the form אָנֹשֵׁב, not אָנֹשֵׁב, cf. § 51 *p*.—In the *participle* the plural נֹשְׁבִי (from יָנָה, with depression of *o* to *u*, cf. § 27 *n*) is found in Zp 3¹⁸; cf. La 1⁴. While in these cases some doubt may be felt as to the correctness of the Masoretic pointing, much more is this so in the perfect נִלְחָד *null'edhū*, 1 Ch 3⁵, 20⁸, for נִלְחָד which appears to be required by the *wāw* in the initial syllable.

6. In the *imperfect Piel* elision of the first radical (*y*) sometimes takes place *u* after *wāw* consec. (as in the case of א, § 68 *k*), e.g. וַיֵּנָה for וַיִּנָּה and he has grieved, La 3³³, וַיִּדְדוּ for וַיִּדְדוּ and they have cast, verse 53, from יָדָה, which may also be a true verb פ"י (on the other hand, in יָדְדוּ גִזְרֵל they have cast lots, Jo 4³, Ob 1¹, Na 3¹⁰, a perfect *Qal* of יָדַד is required by the context; but as this, being a *transitive* perfect, ought to have the form יָדְדוּ according to § 67 *a*, perhaps we should read יָדְדוּ). So from a verb פ"י, of the second class, וַיַּבֵּשׂהוּ for וַיַּבֵּשׂהוּ and he made it dry, Na 1⁴; cf. וַיִּשְׁרֵם 2 Ch 32³⁰ *Qere* (the *Keth.* points either to *Piel* וַיִּשְׁרֵם or *Hiph'il* וַיַּשְׁרֵם).

7. The *imperative Hiph'il*, instead of the usual form הוֹשִׁיב, sometimes has *i* in the second syllable; הוֹשִׁיב Is 43⁸; הוֹשִׁיעַ ψ 94¹ (before ה, hence probably a mere mistake for הוֹשִׁיעַ). On the uncertainty of the tone in הוֹשִׁיעַהֲנָא see § 53 *m*. When closed by a guttural the second syllable generally has *ā*, as הוֹשִׁעַ, cf. also הָקֵר Pr 25¹⁷ (as in the *infin. constr.* הוֹכֵחַ Jb 6²⁶; see § 65 *f*). On the other hand, *i* always appears when the syllable is open, thus הוֹשִׁיב, הוֹשִׁיבִי, and so also before suffixes (§ 61 *g*). הוֹצִיא Gn 8¹⁷ *Qere* (*Keth.* הוֹצִיא, see § 70 *b*) is irregular.—The *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive Hiph'il* when the tone is drawn back take *S'ghōl* in the second syllable, as in *Qal*, e.g. יִזְכֶּךָ that he may increase, Pr 1⁵, before זָכַח; cf. Ex 10²⁸ and Dt 3²⁶ after אָל; יִזְכֶּךָ (Pr 30⁶ is anomalous); in *pause*, however, also תוֹסֵף as *jussive*, Jb 40³² (usual *jussive* in *pause* יוֹשֵׁב, &c., which occurs even without the *pause* after *wāw* consecutive, Gn 47¹¹, Jos 24³, 2 S 8⁴, &c.). With a final guttural יִדַּע and יוֹכַח (*jussive*) and יוֹכַח, &c.; with a final ר in *pause* וַתִּתֵּן Ru 2¹⁴: וַיִּשְׁעֶכֶם Is 35⁴, cf. § 65 *f*).—On forms like יוֹשִׁיעַ, see § 53 *q*.

In *Hoph'al* *o* stands instead of *y*, in הוֹדַע (for הוֹדַע) Lv 4^{23,28}, הִנָּה 2 S 20¹³, זע and perhaps in יוֹרָא (for יוֹרָה) Pr 11²⁶; but cf. Delitzsch on the passage.—*Ptcp.* מוֹדַעַת Is 12⁵ *Qere* (מִדַּעַת *Keth.*).—An *infinitive Hoph'al* with feminine ending occurs in הִלָּחַת Gn 40²⁰, for הוֹלִי' = הוֹלִי; cf. above, *t*, on נִלְחָד, and § 71 at the end.

8. The verb הָלַךְ to go, also belongs in some respects to the פ"י class, since it *u* forms (as if from הָלַךְ) *imperfect* יִלְכֶּה, with *wāw* consecutive וַיִּלְכֶּה (in *pause* וַיִּלְכֶּה Gn 24⁶¹, &c.), 1st sing. וַאֲלַךְ (but in Jb 19¹⁰ וַאֲלַךְ); *infinitive construct* לֵכֶת with suff. לֵכֶתִי (*S'ghōl* under the influence of the following palatal, as in נִכְרִי, cf. also נִכְרִי); *imperative* לֵךְ, לֵךְ, in the lengthened form לֵכֶה (as an interjection referring even to a *feminine*, Gn 19³², or a *plural*, Gn 31⁴⁴) and לֵךְ (Nu 23¹³, Ju 19¹³, 2 Ch 25¹⁷); *Hiph.* הוֹלִיךְ (also in Ex 2⁹ הוֹלִיכִי 2nd *fem.* *imperative* is to be read for הוֹלִיכִי, which probably arose merely through

confusion with the following הִינָקְחוּ ; *imperfect* יוֹלִיף, but in the 1st sing. of the *imperfect consecutive* always וְיֹאמַרְךָ Lv 26¹³, Am 2¹⁰, &c. Rarely, and almost exclusively late or in poetry, the regular inflexions of הִלָּךְ are also found : *imperf.* יִהְלֶךְ (ψ 58⁹, &c.; but הִהְלֶךְ Ex 9²³, ψ 73⁹; cf. § 64 a and h); אֶהְלֶךְ Jb 16²², also Mēša' inscription, line 14, אֶהֱלֶךְ ; *inf.* הִלָּךְ (Ex 3¹³, Nu 22^{13 f. 16}, 1 Ec 68⁹) ; *imperative plur.* הִלְכוּ Jer 51⁵⁰. On the other hand, the *perfect Qal* is always הָלַךְ, *participle* הֹלֵךְ, *infinitive absolute* הֵלֹךְ, *Niph'al* נִהְלָךְ, *Piel* הִקְלַךְ, *Hithpa'el* הִתְהַלַּךְ, so that a י never appears unmistakably as the first radical. The usual explanation of the above forms is nevertheless based on a supposed obsolete ילָךְ. It is, however, more correct to regard the apparent פ' forms of הִלָּךְ with Praetorius (ZAW. ii. 310 ff.) as originating with the Hiph'il, of which the ground-form *hahlikh* became *hālikh*, and this again, on the analogy of the *imperfect Qal* of verbs פִּא, הֹלִיכְה. This *hōlikh* being referred to a supposed *haulikh* (properly *hawlikh*) gave rise to new formations after the manner of verbs פ'.

§ 70. Verbs פ' *Second Class, or Verbs properly פ',*
e. g. יָטַב *to be good. Paradigm L.*

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 143 ff. ; *Grundriss*, p. 603 ff.

Verbs properly פ' differ from verbs פ' in the following points :

- a 1. In *Qal* the initial Yôdh never suffers aphaeresis or elision ; hence the *infinitive* has the form יָבֵשׁ,² the *imperfect* יִבֵּן, יִבֵּן, יִבֵּן (in *pause* יִבֵּן), also written יָבֵן, &c. ; and so always with a tone-bearing *ā* in the second syllable, even after *wāw consec.*, e. g. וַיִּבֵּן, except וַיִּבְנוּ Gn 9²⁴, and וַיִּצַּר Gn 27¹⁹, unless יָצַר is to be included among verbs פ' (cf. נִצַּר Is 43¹⁰).
- b 2. In *Hiph'il* the original form הִיטִיב is regularly contracted to הִיטִיב (rarely written הִטִּיב, הִיטִּב, &c.) ; *imperfect* יִטֵּב, יִטֵּב. Instances of the uncontracted form are יִטְבוּ Pr 4²⁵, according to Barth (see above, § 67 p), an example of an *i-imperfect* of *Qal*, since the *Hiph'il* is otherwise always *causative* ; הִיטֵב (imperative) ψ 5⁹ *Qerê* (the *Keth.* requires הוֹטֵב according to the form of verbs פ' ; cf. Is 45², אֶהֱטֵב *Keth.*, אֶהֱטֵב *Qerê*), cf. Gn 8¹⁷ *Qerê* ; מִיִּטְבוּ 1 Ch 12², to be explained as a denominative from יָטַב ; אֶיטְבוּ Ho 7¹² (§ 24 f, note), but perhaps the punctuation here is only intended to suggest another reading אֶיטְבוּ.

¹ Cf. above, m, note 2.

² This may be inferred from בִּיבֵשׁ (= בִּי') Is 27¹¹, which with its fem. בִּיבֵשֶׁת Gn 8⁷, is the only example of an *infinitive construct Qal* of these verbs. No example of the *imperative Qal* is found : consequently the forms יָטַב, &c. (in Paradigm L of the earlier editions of this Grammar), are only inferred from the *imperfect*.

Rem. 1. The only verbs of this kind are : יָטַב *to be good* (only in the *imperfect Qal* and in *Hiph'il* ; in the *perfect Qal* טוֹב, a verb עָזַי, is used instead), יָנַק *to suck*, יָקַן *to awake*, יָצַר *to form* (but see above, a), יָלַל only in *Hiph'il* יָלִיל *to bewail*, יָשַׁר *to be straight, right*, also יָבֵשׁ (Arabic *yābisa*) *to be dry* (but *Hiph'il* הוֹבִישׁ 2 S 19⁶, on the analogy of verbs פָּזַח ; on Is 30⁵, cf. § 72 x), and the *Hiph'il* הִימִין (denominative from יָמִין), *infin.* לְהִמִּין 2 S 14¹⁹ *to go to the right*.

2. In some examples of the *imperfect Hiph'il* the preformative has been subsequently added to the contracted form : יִיטִיב Jb 24²¹ ; יִילִל Is 15^{2,3}, 16⁷ ; יִיאִלִל Jer 48⁸¹ ; plur. יִיאִלִלוּ Ho 7¹⁴, cf. Is 65¹⁴. Qimḥi and others explain the above forms from a phonetic interchange of *Yôdh* and *He*, arising from the unsyncopated forms יִיהִלִל, &c. (cf. Is 52⁵). It is, perhaps, more correct to suppose that the regular forms (יִיטִיב, יִיאִלִל) were originally intended, but that in the later pronunciation the syllable was broken up in order to restore artificially the preformative which had become merged in the first radical.

Isolated anomalies are : *perfect Hiph'il* וְהִיטַבְתִּי Ez 36¹¹ with separating vowel (for הִיטַבְתִּי) on the analogy of verbs עָזַי ; *imperfect* יִיטִיב for יִיטִיב 1 K 14⁷ ; הִיטִיב (*imperfect Qal* for הִיטִיב) Na 3⁸ ; וְהִיטִיב *imperfect Hiph'il* Ex 2⁹, either an error for וְהִיטִיב, or an irregular shortening of the first syllable, caused by the forward movement of the tone. Similarly, the *Hiph'il* הִקִּין (from קִין) is always used instead of הִקִּיין from יָקַן ; hence also הִקִּיצוֹת, *imperat.* הִקִּיצָה, *infin.* הִקִּיין.—On וְהִיטִיב Na 1⁴, see § 69 u).

§ 71. Verbs פ"י. Third Class, or Verbs with *Yôdh* assimilated.

In some verbs פ"י, the *Yôdh* (or the original *Wāw*) does not quiesce in the preceding vowel, but is regarded as a full consonant, and, like *Nûn*,¹ is assimilated to the following consonant. These forms, therefore, belong properly to the class of strong verbs. Assimilation invariably takes place in יָצַע (prop. יָצַע) *to spread under* ; *Hiph'il* הִצִּיעַ, *Hoph'al* הִצַּע ; יָצַח *to burn*, *imperfect* יִצַּח, *Niph'al* נִצַּח, *Hiph'il* הִצִּיתָ (in Is 27⁴ also אֲצִיִּתָּה is to be read with König ; in 2 S 14³⁰ the Masora has rightly emended the *Kethib* הוֹצִיִּתָּה, which could only be the 1st sing. perf. of a verb פָּזַח, to the imperative הִצִּיִּתָּה in agreement with the context and all the early versions) ; יָצַג, *Hiph'il* הִצִּיג *to place*, *Hoph'al* הִצַּג ; and probably also in the forms ordinarily derived from יָצַב, viz. נִצַּב (*Niph'al*), הִצִּיב, יִצַּב, הִצַּב ; at any rate a stem יָצַב is implied by the *Hithpa'el* הִתְצַב ; instead of the anomalous וְהִתְצַב Ex 2⁴ read with the Samaritan וְהִתְצַב, i.e. וְהִתְצַב. Besides the common form we find once אֶצַּק in Is 44³ (from יָצַק *to pour*) with a *transitive* meaning, beside אֶצַּק *intransitive*, 1 K 22³⁵. Elsewhere the *imperfect*

¹ These verbs, like verbs עָזַי (cf. above, note on § 67 g), may perhaps have been influenced by the analogy of verbs פָּזַח.

consecutive has the form וַיֵּצֵא Gn 28¹⁸, 35¹⁴, &c., cf. § 69 *f*, where also other forms of יֵצֵא are given; וַיֵּצֵר and יָצַר (Is 44¹², 49³, Jer 1⁵ *Qerê*), from יָצַר to *form*, are, however, used in the same sense. Cf. also אָפַרם Ho 10¹⁰; וַיִּשְׁרָנָה (for וַיֵּרָא according to § 47 *k*) 1 S 6¹²; לִיפֹר 2 Ch 31⁷ (cf. § 69 *n*) and מוֹפֵר Is 28¹⁶. This assimilation is found always with sibilants (most frequently with צ) except in the case of וַיִּבֶן 1 K 3¹⁵ (so ed. Mant., Ginsb., Kittel; but Jabl., Baer וַיִּבֶן) and in הִלָּחַת Gn 40²⁰, Ez 16⁵ (cf. הוֹלִיחַת verse 4), *infinitive Hoph'al* of יָלַד (cf. נִלְדָּו § 69 *t*).

§ 72. Verbs ע"ו (*vulgo* ו"ע), e.g. קָם to rise up. *Paradigm M.*

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 144 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 605 ff.

- a* 1. According to § 67 *a* a large number of monosyllabic stems were brought into agreement with the triliteral form by a strengthening, or repetition, of the second radical, i.e. of the *consonantal* element in the stem. In another large class of stems the same object has been attained by strengthening the *vocalic* element. The ground-form used for these verbs is not, as in other cases (§ 39 *a*), the 3rd *sing. masc. perfect*, but always the *infinitive construct* form (§ 39 *b*), the *û* of which is characteristic also of the *imperative* and of the *imperfect indicative Qal*. These stems are consequently termed verbs ו"ע or more correctly (see below) ע"ו.¹

¹ The term ע"ו was consequent on the view that the *Wāw* (or ו in the case of verbs ו"ע) in these stems was originally consonantal. This view seemed especially to be supported by the return of the *Wāw* in *Pi'el* (עוּר), the ו usually passing into ו as in קים, cf. Arabic *qāwūmā*, and by certain forms of the *absolute state* of the nouns of such stems, e.g. מוֹת death, compared with מוֹת to die. Hence in explaining the verbal forms a supposed stem *qawam* (in verbs ו"ע e.g. *šayat*) was always assumed, and יקם was referred to an original *yaqawūm*, the *infinitive absolute* קים to original *qawōm*, the *participle passive* קים to original *qawūm*. It must, however, be admitted: (1) that forms like עוּר, קים (see *m*) are only to be found in the latest books, and are hence evidently secondary as compared with the pure Hebrew forms קוּמם, &c.; (2) that to refer the verbal forms invariably to the stem קוּם, leads in many cases to phonetic combinations which are essentially improbable, whereas the assumption of original *middle-vowel* stems renders a simple and natural explanation almost always possible. These ע"ו stems are therefore to be rigidly distinguished from the real ו"ע stems of the strong forms, such as כוּן, בּוּע, &c. (see below, *gg*).—As early as the eleventh century the right view with regard to ע"ו stems was taken by Samuel Hannagid (cf. Bacher, *Leben und Werke des Abulwa'id*, p. 16); recently by Böttcher (*Lehrbuch*, § 1112), and (also as to ו"ע stems) especially by Müller, Stade, and Wellhausen (see above, § 67 *a*, note). On the other hand, the old view of ו and ו as consonants has been recently revived by Philippi, Barth, M. Lambert, and especially Brockelmann (op. cit.).

2. As in the case of verbs ע"י, the monosyllabic stem of verbs ע"י *b* generally takes the vowel which would have been required in the *second* syllable of the ordinary strong form, or which belonged to the ground-form, since this is essentially characteristic of the verbal form (§ 43 *b*; § 67 *b*). However, it is to be remarked: (a) that the vowel, short in itself, becomes of necessity long in an open syllable as well as in a tone-bearing closed *ultima* (except in *Hoph'al*, see *d*), e. g. 3rd *sing. masc. perf.* קָם, *fem.* קָמָה, *plur.* קָמוּ, but in a closed *penultima* קָמָה, &c.¹; (b) that in the forms as we now have them the lengthening of the original short vowel sometimes takes place irregularly. Cf. *f*.

Intransitive verbs *middle e* in the *perfect Qal* have the form מֵת *he is dead*; verbs *middle o* have the form אֹר *he shone*, בֹּשׁ *he was ashamed*, טוֹב *he was good*.² Cf. *n-r*.

3. In the *imperfect Qal*, *perfect Niph'al*, and throughout *Hiph'il* and *d Hoph'al* the short vowel of the preformatives in an open syllable before the tone is changed into the corresponding tone-long vowel. In *Qal* and *Niph'al* the original *ā* is the basis of the form and not the *i* attenuated from *ā* (§ 67 *h*; but cf. also *h* below, on יִבֹּשׁ), hence יָקִים, for *yāqûm*; נִקְוִים for *nāqôm*; on the other hand, in the *perfect Hiph'il* הִקִּים for *hūqîm*; *participle* מִקִּים (on the *Şere* cf. *z*); *perfect Hoph'al* הֻקַּם for *hūqam*.

A vowel thus lengthened before the tone is naturally changeable and *ē* becomes vocal *Šewā* when the tone is moved forward, e. g. יִמְיֹתָו *he will kill him*; so also in the 3rd *plur. imperfect Qal* with *Nûn paragoric*; יִמְוִתוּן (without *Nûn* יִמְוִתוּ). The wholly abnormal *scriptio plena* of *ē* in הִימִיר Jer 2¹¹ (beside הִמִּיר in the same verse) should, with König, be emended to הִימִיר; the incorrect repetition of the interrogative necessarily led to the pointing of the form as *perfect* instead of *imperfect*.—But in *Hoph'al* the *ū* is retained throughout as an unchangeable vowel, when it has been introduced by an abnormal lengthening for the tone-long *ō* (as in the *Hoph'al* of verbs ע"ע).

¹ In Aramaic, however, always קָמָה; also in Hebrew grammars before *Qimhi* קָמָה, קָמָה, &c., are found, but in our editions of the Bible this occurs only in *pause*, e. g. קָמָה, Mi 7⁸, קָמָה 2 K 7^{3.4}.

² According to Ståde (*Grammatik*, § 385 *e* and *f*) the *e* in מֵת is of the nature of a diphthong (from *ai*, which arose from the union of the vowel *i*, the sign of the intransitive, with the *ā* of the root), and likewise the *o* in אֹר, &c. (from *au*). But *ō* (from *au*) could not, by § 26 *p*, remain in a closed *penultima* (בֹּשׁ, &c.); consequently the *o* of these forms can only be tone-long, i. e. due to lengthening of an original *ū*, and similarly the *ē* of מֵת to lengthening of an original *i*. This is confirmed by the fact that the *ō* in בֹּשְׁתִּי, בֹּשְׁתִּי, בֹּשְׁתִּי is always, and in בֹּשְׁתִּי, 3rd *plur. perfect*, nearly always (the instances are 11 to 2), written defectively. Forms like בֹּשְׁתִּי, בֹּשְׁתִּי, &c., are therefore due to orthographic licence.

f 4. The cases of unusual vowel lengthening mentioned in *b* are: *imperfect Qal* יָקַם (also in Arabic *yāqūmu*), but *jussive* with normal lengthening (§ 48 *g*), יָקַם, with retraction of the tone יָקַם (yāqōm), יָקַם (in *pause* יָקַם); *imperative* יָקַם, with normal lengthening of the *ū* in the 2nd *plur. fem.* יָקַם, since, according to § 26 *p*, the *ū* cannot be retained in a closed penultima; *infinitive construct* יָקַם. In *Hiph'il* the original *ī* is naturally lengthened to *ī* (יָקַם, *imperfect* יָקַם, *jussive* יָקַם, with retraction of the tone יָקַם, יָקַם); on the transference of this *ī* to the *Hiph'il* of the strong verb, cf. § 53 *a*.

g The following forms require special consideration: the *participle Qal* יָקַם is to be traced to the ground-form with *ā* unobscured, Arab. *qātīl*, § 9 *q*, and § 50 *b*. On this analogy the form would be *qā'im*,¹ which after absorption of the *ī* became יָקַם, owing to the predominating character of the *ā*. The unchangeableness of the *ā* (*plur.* יָקַם, *constr.* יָקַם, &c.) favours this explanation.

h In the *imperfect Qal*, besides the forms with original *ū* (now *ū*) there are also forms with original *ā*. This *ā* was lengthened to *ā*, and then further obscured to *ō*; hence especially יָבֹא (יָבֹא), &c., from the *perfect* יָבֹא *he has come*. In the *imperfects* יָבֹא (but cf. יָבֹא I S 14²⁷) and יָבֹא from the *intransitive perfects* יָבֹא, יָבֹא (see above, *c*), most probably also in יָבֹא 2 K 12⁹, יָבֹא Gn 34¹⁵ from an unused יָבֹא *to consent*, and perhaps in יָבֹא I S 4⁵, &c., as in the cases noticed in § 63 *e* and especially § 67 *n*, the *ē* of the preformative is lengthened from *ī* (which is attenuated from original *ā*) and thus *yī-bāš* became *yī-bāš*, and finally *yē-bōš*. Finally the *Niph.* יָקַם (*nā-qām*), *imperfect* יָקַם from *yīqqām*, originally (§ 51 *m*) *yinqām*, arises in the same way from the obscuring of *ā* lengthened from *ā*.

i 5. In the *perfect Niph'al* and *Hiph'il* a *ī* is inserted before the affirmatives beginning with a consonant in the 1st and 2nd persons, and יָ regularly (but see Rem.) in the *imperfect Qal*, sometimes also in the *imperfect Hiph'il* (as in יָבֹא לִי Lv 7³⁰, cf. יָבֹא Mi 2¹²), before the termination of יָ. As in verbs ע"ע (§ 67 *d* and note) these *separating vowels* serve as an artificial opening of the preceding syllable, in order to preserve the long vowel; in the *perfect Hiph'il*, however, before the *ī*, instead of the *ī* an *ē* is somewhat often found² (as a normal lengthening of the original *ī*), especially after *wāw con-*

¹ So in Arabic, prop. *qā'im*, since the two vowels are kept apart by the insertion of an *ā*, cf. Aram. יָבֹא; but also contracted, as *šāk*, *hār*, for *šā'ik*, &c. (cf. Wright's *Gramm. of the Arabic Language*, 2nd ed. vol. i. p. 164).

² יָבֹא I S 6⁷ (cf. 2 Ch 6²⁵) could only be an orthographic licence for יָבֹא; perhaps, however, יָבֹא was originally intended.

secutive, Dt 4³⁹, 30¹, as well as before the affirmatives תָּם and הֵן or before suffixes, Dt 22², 1 S 6⁸, 1 K 8³⁴, Ez 34⁴. For in all these cases the tone is removed from the *i* to the following syllable, and this forward movement of the tone produces at the same time a weakening of the *i* to *e*; thus הָקִים, הַקִּימוֹת, (or הִקֵּן; on הַעֲרֹתָה Ex 19²³, cf. *x*), but וַהֲקִמְתָּ, &c., Ex 26³⁰, &c.; Dt 4³⁹, Nu 18²⁶ (cf., however, וַהֲקִמְנוּ Mi 5⁴). In the same way in the 1st pers. sing. of the *perfect Niph'al*, the *o* before the separating vowel is always modified to *u* (נִקְוֹמוֹתִי); cf. *v*. In the *imperfect Qal* and *Hiph'il* the separating vowel ' always bears the tone (תִּקְוִינָה).

Without the separating vowel and consequently with the tone-long *o* and *k* *e* instead of *u* and *i* we find in *imperfect Qal* תִּבְאֵנָה (see § 76 *g*); תִּשְׁבְּךָ Ez 16⁵⁵ (also תִּשְׁבְּכֵנָה in the same verse); וַתִּשְׁבְּנָה 1 S 7¹⁴ (cf. Ez 35⁹ *Qeré*; on the *Kethibh* תִּישְׁבְּנָה cf. above, note on § 69 *b*); וַתִּאָרְנָה 1 S 14²⁷ from אֹרַר (*Kethibh* וַתִּרְאָנָה and they saw, see § 75 *w*); in *Hiph'il*, e.g. הִנִּיפֹתִי Ex 20²⁵, also הִנִּיפֹתִי Jb 31²¹; וַהֲמַלְתִּי Jer 22⁵⁶; תִּשְׁבְּנָה Jb 20¹⁰; with a separating vowel, e.g. תִּבְאֵינָה Lv 7³⁰ from בּוֹא. *Seghól* without *i* occurs in the *imperfect Qal* in תִּמּוֹתֶיךָ Ez 13¹⁹, Zc 1¹⁷; and in *Hiph'il* Mi 2¹²: the Dageš in the *Nún* is, with Baer, to be rejected in all three cases according to the best authorities. Wholly abnormal is תִּקְיֹמְנָה Jer 44²⁵, probably an erroneous transposition of יִמ (for תִּקְיֹמְנָה), unless it originates from an incorrect spelling תִּקְיֹמְנָה or תִּקְיֹמְנָה.

6. The tone, as in verbs ע"ו (cf. § 67 *k*), is also generally retained *l* on the stem-syllable in verbs ע"ו before the affirmatives הֵן, י, ' ; thus קָמָה (but also קָמָה 2 K 19²¹, probably for the sake of rhythmical uniformity with the following קָמָה; after *wāw consecutive* וַשְׁכָּה Is 23¹⁷); קָמוּ (but also קָמוּ, cf. Is 28⁷, 29⁹, Na 3¹⁸, ψ 76⁶, Pr 5⁶, La 4¹⁸; וְקָמוּ 1 S 8¹¹; so especially before a following א, cf. § 49 *l*, Nu 13³²; וְקָמוּ Is 19¹; before ע, ψ 131¹, Pr 30¹³, La 4¹⁴); תִּקְוִי, but before a suffix or with *Nún paragogic* וַיִּסְכּוּ 2 Ch 28¹⁵; וַיִּקְוּ Dt 33¹¹, &c.

7. The formation of the conjugations *Pī'el*, *Pu'al*, and *Hithpa'el* is, *m* strictly speaking, excluded by the nature of verbs ע"ו. It is only in the latest books that we begin to find a few secondary formations, probably borrowed from Aramaic, on the analogy of verbs ע"ו (with consonantal ו, see below, *gg*); e.g. the *Pī'el* עָוֵר to surround, only in עָוֵרְנִי ψ 119⁶¹; and with change of ו to י, קָיָם Est 9³¹, קָיָמוּ Est 9²⁷, *impf.* וַאֲקַיְמָה ψ 119¹⁰⁶, *inf.* קָיָם Ez 13⁶, Ru 4⁷ &c., Est 9²¹ &c., *imperat.* קָיְמִי ψ 119²⁸; וַתִּיבָהֶם Dn 1¹⁰ from הִיב to be guilty. The *Hithpa'el* הִצְטִיִּיר Jos 9¹², which belongs to the older language, is probably a denominative from צִיר. On the other hand the otherwise less common conjugation *Pōl'el* (see § 55 *c*), with its passive and reflexive, is usually

employed in the sense of *Pi'el* and as a substitute for it, e.g. *קוּמִים* to set up from *קום*; *מוֹתֶת* to slaughter, 1 S 14¹³, 17⁵¹, 2 S 1⁹, from *מוֹת*; *רוּמִים* to exalt, passive *רוּמָם*, from *רום*; reflexive *הִתְעוֹרֵר* to stir up oneself (cf. *יִתְעַרֵּר* Jb 17⁸ in pause) from *עיר*; reciprocal *הִתְבַּשֵּׁשׁ* to be ashamed before one another, Gn 2²⁵. The conjugation *Pilpāl* (§ 55 f), on the analogy of verbs ע"ע, is less common, e.g. *טָלַטַל* to hurl away from *טיל*; *בִּלְבַּל* to contain from *ביל*; *קָרַר* to destroy from *קיר*.

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

- n 1. Of verbs middle *e* and *o*, in which, as in the strong verb, the perfect and participle have the same form (§ 50. 2), the following are the only examples: *מָת* he is dead, fem. *מָתָה*, 2nd masc. *מָתָה* (cf. § 44 g; § 66 h); 1st sing. *מָתִי*, *וּמָתִי* (even in pause, Gn 19¹⁹); plur. *מָתִי*, 1st pers. *מָתִינוּ*, in pause *מָתִינוּ*; *בָּשׁ* he was ashamed, *בָּשָׁה*, *בָּשָׁתִי*, *בָּשָׁנוּ*; *בָּשׂוּ*; *אֹר* it has shone, plur. *אֹרוּ*; *טוֹב* to be good, *טָבוּ*. Participles *מָת* a dead man (plur. *מָתִים*, *מָתִי*); *בוֹשָׁם* ashamed, Ez 32³⁰. For *נָד* Is 27¹¹ read *נָדַר*, or, with LXX, *עָד*.
- o Isolated anomalies in the perfect are: *וְשָׁבַת* (with the original ending of the fem. for *וְשָׁבְתָה*) Ez 46¹⁷ (see § 44 f); *צָקִין* Is 26¹⁶ (see § 44 l).—In *בָּנוּ* 1 S 25⁸ (for *בָּאנוּ* from *בוא*) the *א* has been dropped contrary to custom. In *יבֹאֵו* Jer 27¹⁸ (instead of *יבֹאֵי*) the Masora seems to point to the imperfect which is what would be expected; as *Yôdh* precedes, it is perhaps simply a scribal error.
- p The form *קָם* occurs (cf. § 9 b) with *א* in the perfect, *קָאם* Ho 10¹⁴, also in the participles *לָאט* softly, Ju 4²¹, *רָאשׁ* poor, 2 S 12^{1.4}, Pr 10⁴, plur. 13²³; *שְׂאֲטִים* doing despite unto (unless *שְׂאֲטִים* is to be read, from a stem *שָׂאט* whence *שָׂאט* Ez 25¹⁵, 36⁶), Ez 28^{24.25}; fem. 16⁶⁷; also in Ze 14¹⁰ *רָאמָה* is to be read with Ben-Naphtali for *רָאמָה*. On the analogy of participles of verbs middle *o* (like *בוֹשָׁם*, see above) *קוּמִים* occurs for *קָמִים* 2 K 16⁷ and even with a transitive meaning *לוֹט* occultans, Is 25⁷; *בוֹסִים* Ze 10⁵.—Participle passive, *מוֹל* circumcised; but *סוֹג* a backslider, Pr 14¹⁴, and *סוֹרָה* put aside, Is 49²¹ (cf. Jer 17¹³ *Qêrê*), are verbal adjectives of the form *qātûl* (§ 50 f), not passive participles. For *חָשִׁים* hastening, Nu 32¹⁷, read *חָשִׁים* as in Ex 13¹⁸; for *שׁוּבִי* Mi 2⁸ read *שָׁבִי*.
- q 2. Imperfects in *û* almost always have the corresponding imperative and infinitive construct in *û*, as *יָקוּם*, imperative and infinitive *קוּם* (also defectively written *קָם*); but *יָדוּשׁ* he threshes (infin. *דָּוַשׁ*), has imperative *דָּוְשִׁי* (fem.), Mi 4¹³; *יָמוּט* it slippeth, infinitive *מוֹט* (ψ 38¹⁷, 46³); cf. *נוֹחַ* (also *נוּחַ*) Nu 11²⁵ and *נוֹעַ* Is 7² (elsewhere *נוֹעַ*) with the imperfects *יָנוּחַ* and *יָנוּעַ*; *לָעוֹז* Is 30²; *שׁוּב* Jos 2¹⁶; *רוּם* Ez 10¹⁷ (verse 16 *רוּם*).
- r Where the imperfect (always intransitive in meaning) has *o* the imperative and infinitive also have it; thus imperfect *יָבוֹא* (*יבֹא*), infin. and imper. *בּוֹא* or *בֹּא*¹; *וַיֵּאָר* 2 S 2³², *אֹרִי*, *אֹרוּ*, *יָבוּשׁ*, *בוּשׁ*, &c.—*יָקוּם* Jb 8¹⁴ (if it be a verb at all and not rather a substantive) is formed on the analogy of verbs ע"ע,

¹ In 1 K 14¹² (*בִּבְאָה* before a genitive), the text is evidently corrupt: read with Klostermann after the LXX *בִּבְאָה*.

since the *imperfect* of קִיט appears as אָקִיט in ψ 95¹⁰. On the other hand יִקְשֹׁן (as if from קָשׁ, on the analogy of יָבוֹא, &c.) occurs as *imperfect* of יָקֵשׁ (פ"י). The *imperfect* יִרְוֶן, with δ , Gn 6³, probably in the sense of *to rule*, has no corresponding *perfect*, and is perhaps intentionally differentiated from the common verb יָרִין *to judge* (from יָרִין, ע"י). Or can יִרְוֶן be a *jussive* after לֹא (cf. § 109 d)? Similarly לֹא תַחֹם עֵינִי (ע"ינך) might be taken as a case of a *jussive* after לֹא, with irregular *scriptio plena* (as in Ju 16⁸⁰), in Dt 7¹⁶, 13⁹, 19^{13,21}, 25¹², Ez 5¹¹, 7^{4,9}, 8¹⁸, 9¹⁰. But perhaps in all these cases לֹא תַחֹם was originally intended, as in Is 13¹⁸, Jer 21⁷, while cases like יַחֹם ψ 72¹³ are to be explained as in § 109 k.—The *infinitive absolute* always has δ , e.g. יִקְוֹמוּ קוֹם Jer 44²⁹.

3. In the *imperative* with affirmatives (קֹמֵי, קֹמְוֵי) the tone is on the stem δ syllable (cf., however, עֲרִי Ju 5¹² intentionally varied from עָרִי; also עֲרִי Zc 13⁷ and Is 51⁹ beside עֲרִי בְיָמֵי; עֲרִי זֶלְעִי Zc 9⁹; עֲרִי Is 21², ψ 116⁷, likewise for rhythmical reasons). So also the lengthened form, as שִׁבְחָה Jer 3¹², ψ 7⁸, and עֲוִרָה verse 7. But if an מ follows in close connexion, the lengthened *imperative* usually has the form קֹמְחָה, &c.¹ in order to avoid a hiatus, e.g. Ju 4¹³, ψ 82⁸; hence also before יָהוָה, *Qéré perpetuum* יִאֲדָנִי (§ 17 c), e.g. ψ 3⁸, 7⁷ קֹמְחָה (cf., however, in the same verse עֲוִרָה and in Jer 40⁵, עֲוִרָה before א), and so even before ר ψ 43¹, 74²³, &c. (רִיבָה).

4. In the *jussive*, besides the form יָקֵם (see above, f), יָקוֹם also occurs τ (as subjunctive, Ec 12⁴; נָסוּג ψ 80¹⁰ may also, with Delitzsch, be regarded as a volutative), incorrectly written *plene*, and יָקֵם (Gn 27³¹; cf. Ju 6¹⁸, Pr 9^{4,16}), which, however, is only orthographically different from יָקוֹם (cf. Jer 46⁶). In the *imperfect consecutive* (וַיָּקֵם, in *pause* וַיָּקֵם, see above, f) if there be a guttural or ר in the last syllable, \tilde{a} often takes the place of δ , e.g. וַיֵּנַח and he rested; וַיִּנְעַע and it was moved; וַיִּסָּר and he turned aside, Ju 4¹⁸, Ru 4¹ (distinguished only by the sense from *Hiph'il* וַיִּסָּר and he removed, Gn 8¹³); וַיִּצַּר Ex 21⁴, 2 K 5²³, 17⁵ (but also וַיִּגָּר from both גָּר *to sojourn*, and גָּר *to fear*); וַיַּעֲפָ (to be distinguished from וַיִּעָּפָ and he flew, Is 6⁶) and he was weary, Ju 4²¹, 1 S 14^{28,31}, 2 S 21¹⁵, but probably in all these cases וַיַּעֲפָ for וַיִּעָּפָ from יָעַף is intended. For וַחֲלוּשׁ 2 S 13⁸ *Keth.*, the *Qéré* rightly requires וַחֲלָשׁ. On the other hand, in an open syllable always וַיִּקְוֹמוּ, וַיִּסְאֲרוּ, &c. On וַאֲקִימוּ (וַאֲקִימוּ), see § 49 e.

Examples of the full plural ending וִן with the tone (see above, l) are וִן Gn 3^{3,4}; וִן ψ 104⁷; וִן Jo 2^{4,7,9}.

II. On Niph'al.

5. The form of the 1st *sing. perf.* נִקְוֹמוֹתִי, which frequently occurs (נִסְאֲרוֹתִי, ψ נִפְגֹּתִי, cf. also the *ptcp. plur.* נִבְּוִיִּם Ex 14⁸), serves as a model for the 2nd *sing.* נִקְוֹמוֹת, נִקְוֹמוֹת, and the 1st *plur.* נִקְוֹמוֹנוּ given in the paradigm, although no instances of these forms are found; but of the 2nd *plur.* the

¹ Cf. Delitzsch's commentary on ψ 3⁸.

only examples found have δ (not \acute{u}), viz. נִפְּזָתָם *ye have been scattered*, Ez 11¹⁷, 20^{34,41}, and וְנִקְמָתָם *and ye shall loathe yourselves*, Ez 20⁴³, 36³¹.—To the \ddot{i} (instead of \ddot{a}) of the preformative may be traced the *perfect* נִעוֹר Zc 2¹⁷ (analogous to the *perfect* and *participle* נָפּוּל , see below, *ee*), *imperfect* יַעוֹר for יִעוֹר .—The *infinitive construct* הָדוּשׁ occurs in Is 25¹⁰; in לְהָאֹר Jb 33³⁰, the Masora assumes the elision of the ה (for לְהָאֹר); but probably לְאֹר (*Qal*) is intended (see § 51 *l*).— נָמוּג Is 14³¹, נָסוּג Is 59¹³ are to be regarded as *infinitives absolute*.

III. On *Hiph'il*, *Hoph'al*, and *Pi'lel*.

6. Examples of the *perfect* without a separating vowel (see above, *k*) are: הִכָּתַתְּ , &c. (see further, § 76 *g*); הִכְמָתָה (from מָוֶת) for hēmāth-tā (cf. § 20 *a*); הִכְנִי 1st plur. *perfect* *Hiph'il* from בֵּן 2 Ch 29¹⁹, even הִכְמָתָם (§ 27 *s*) Nu 17⁶, &c.; cf. 2 S 13²⁸, also וְהִכְמָתָן Ex 1¹⁶, and וְהִכְמָתִיָּהּ Ho 2⁵; but elsewhere, with *wāw* consecutive וְהִכְמָתִי Is 14³⁰; cf. וְהִסְלֵתִי Jer 16¹³, and וְהִנֵּפְתָּ Ex 29²⁴, &c.—In these cases the \bar{e} of the first syllable is retained in the secondary tone; elsewhere in the second syllable before the tone it becomes \bar{e} (1 Ch 15¹², &c.) or more frequently \bar{e} , and in the syllable before the antepenultima it is necessarily \bar{e} (e.g. וְהִקְמָתִי Gn 6¹⁸). Before a suffix in the 3rd sing. masc. (except Gn 40¹³) and *fem.*, and in the 3rd plur., the vowel of the initial syllable is *Ḥateph-Seghol*, in the other persons always *Ḥateph-Pathah* (König); on הִקְמָתוֹ 2 K 9², ψ 89⁴⁴, cf. Ex 19²³, Nu 31²⁸, Dt 4²⁹, 22², 27², 30¹, Ez 34⁴, and above, *i*. The 3rd fem. *perf. Hiph.* הִסְמָתָה 1 K 21²⁵ is quite abnormal for הִסְמִיתָהּ from סִוֶּת or סִית .

As in verbs ע"ע with ה for their first radical (§ 67 *w*), all the forms of עוֹר Ex 19²³ (where against the rule given under *i* we find הַעֲרִיתָהּ with \bar{e} instead of \bar{i}), Dt 8¹⁹, Neh 9³⁴, Jer 42¹⁹, and עוֹר Is 41²⁵, 45¹³, take *Pathah* in these conjugations instead of \bar{e} . The irregular וְהוֹשְׁבוּתִים Zc 10⁶ has evidently arisen from a combination of two different readings, viz. וְהוֹשְׁבוּתִים (from יָשַׁב) and וְהוֹשְׁבוּתִים (from שׁוּב): the latter is to be preferred.—On הִבְיֵשׁ and הוֹבִישׁ as a (metaplastic) *perfect Hiph'il* of בִּישׁ , cf. § 78 *b*.

7. In the *imperative*, besides the short form הִקֵּם (on הָשַׁב Is 42²² with *Silluq*, cf. § 29 *q*; but in Ez 21³⁵ for הָשַׁב read the *infinitive* הָשִׁיב) the lengthened form הִקְיָמָה is also found. With suffix הִקְיָמִנִי , &c. The *imperative* הִבֵּיָא Jer 17¹⁸ is irregular (for הִבֵּא Gn 43¹⁶); perhaps הִבֵּיָא (as in 1 S 20⁴⁰; cf. 2 K 8⁶) is intended, or it was originally הִבֵּיָאָה .

8. In the *infinitive*, elision of the ה occurs in לְבִיָּא Jer 39⁷, 2 Ch 31¹⁰ (for לְהִבֵּיָא); הִ *fem.* is added in לְהִנֵּפָהּ Is 30²⁸; cf. Est 2¹⁸ and the analogous *infinitive Haph'al* in biblical Aramaic, Dn 5²⁰.—As *infinitive absolute* הִכִּין occurs in Ez 7¹⁴ (perh. also Jos 4³, Jer 10²³).—The *participles* have \bar{e} , on the analogy of the *perfect*, as the vowel of the preformative, like verbs ע"ע (§ 67 *i*). On מִבִּי 2 S 5², &c. (in *Kethibh*), see § 74 *k*.

On the shortened forms of the *imperfect* (וַיִּקֵּם , but always וַיָּבֵא ; in the *jussive* also with retraction of the tone אֶל-תָּשִׁיב 1 K 2²⁰) see above, *f*. With a guttural or ר the last syllable generally has *Pathah* (as in *Qal*), e.g. וַיִּעַר *and he testified*, 2 K 17¹³; וַיַּח *let him smell*, 1 S 26¹⁹; וַיָּרַח Gn 8²¹; וַיִּסָּר

and he took away, Gn 8¹³. The 1st sing. of the imperfect consecutive commonly has the form וְאַשִׁיב Neh 2²⁰, or, more often, defectively וְאַעֲד 1 K 2⁴², less frequently the form וְאַשֵׁב Jos 14⁷.—For אָסַף Zp 1² (after אָסַף) and in verse 3, read אָסַף from אָסַף, on the analogy of אָמַר § 68 g: similarly in Jer 8¹³ אָסַפִּים instead of אָסִיפִים.

In the imperfect *Pôtel* the tone is moved backwards before a following tone-syllable, but without a shortening of the vowel of the final syllable; e.g. וְהִתְבַּנֵּן בִּי Pr 14³⁴; לֹא תִהְיוּלָלִים Jb 35¹⁴; cf. Pr 25²³, and acc. to Baer וְהִתְבַּנֵּן בִּי Jb 30²⁰ (ed. Mant., Ginsb. וְהִתְבַּנֵּן בִּי), always in principal pause; on the *Metheg* with *Sere*, cf. § 16 f. γ.—As *Pôtal* cf. יִרְעַע Is 16¹⁰.

As *participle* *Hoph'al* הַמוֹשֵׁב occurs in close connexion, Gn 43¹²; cf. § 65 d.

Peculiar contracted forms of *Pôtel* (unless they are transitives in *Qal*) are *CC* וִיבְנִנְנוּ Jb 31¹⁵, יַעֲזְרֵנוּ 41², וְתִמְנִנְנוּ Is 64⁶ for וִיבְנִנְנוּ, &c. [but read וִיבְנִנְנוּ (§ 58 k) or יַעֲזְרֵנוּ, and וְתִמְנִנְנוּ]; also תִּרְמִים Jb 17⁴, תִּרְמִיִּם.—In Is 15⁵ יַעֲזְרֵנוּ appears to have arisen from the *Pûpel* יַעֲזְרֵנוּ, the *ä* after the loss of the *ṛ* having been lengthened to *ä*, which has then been obscured to *ä*.—For the strange form בְּתִקְוִמְיָהּ ψ 139²¹, which cannot (according to § 52 s) be explained as a *participle* with the *Ṿ* omitted, read בְּתִקְוָהּ.

IV. In General.

8. The verbs ע"ו are primarily related to the verbs ע"ע (§ 67), which were *dd* also originally biliteral, so that it is especially necessary in analysing them to pay attention to the differences between the inflexion of the two classes. Several forms are exactly the same in both, e.g. imperfect *Qal* and *Hiph'il* with *wāw* consecutive, the whole of *Hoph'al*, the *Pîtel* of verbs ע"ו, and the *Pô'el* of verbs ע"ע; see § 67 z. Owing to this close relation, verbs ע"ו sometimes have forms which follow the analogy of verbs ע"ע, e.g. perfect *Qal* בּוּ he has despised (from בּוּז, as if from בָּזוּ) Zc 4¹⁰; perfect *Niph'al* נָמַר Jer 48¹¹ (for נָמַר from מָוַר, as if from מָרַר). The same explanation equally applies to נָקָטָה Jb 10¹ for נָקָטָה (cf. § 67 dd) = נָקָטָה from קָטַט, and נָקָטָה Ez 6⁹ (for נָקָטָה); נָקָטָה Ez 10¹⁷ and יָרָבּוּ verse 15; הִרְבּוּ (*imperative*) Nu 17¹⁰; יָסַג Mi 2⁶; *Hiph'il* perfect הִתּוּ Is 18⁵ for הִתּוּ (cf. § 29 g), which is for הִתּוּ from הִתּוּ. On the other hand the imperfects יָמַר Ex 48¹⁴ (unless it be intended for יָמַר, cf. ψ 15⁴) and יָפַח Hb 2³, are to be regarded according to § 109 i, simply as rhythmically shortened forms of יָמַר and יָפַח.

9. In common with verbs ע"ע (§ 67 g) verbs ע"ו sometimes have in *Niph'al* *ee* and *Hiph'il* the quasi-Aramaic formation, by which, instead of the long vowel under the preformative, they take a short vowel with *Dageš forte* in the following consonant; this variety is frequently found even along with the ordinary form, e.g. הִפִּיתָ to incite, imperfect יָפִיתָ (also הִפִּיתָ, יָפִיתָ); הִפִּיג, imperfect יָפִיג to remove (from סוּג), also *Hoph'al* הִפִּיג Is 59¹⁴ (on הִפִּיג cf. § 29 g); sometimes with a difference of meaning, as הִנִּיחָה to cause to rest,¹ but הִנִּיחָה (*imperfect* יָנִיחָה, *consecutive* וְנִיחָה Gn 39¹⁶; *imperative* הִנִּיחָה, plur. הִנִּיחוּ) to set down; for הִנִּיחָה (Baer, Ginsburg וְהִנִּיחָה) Zc 5¹¹ (which at any rate could only be explained as an isolated passive of *Hiph'il* on the analogy of the biblical Aramaic הִקִּימָה Dn 7⁴) we should probably read וְהִנִּיחָה with

¹ As the passive of this *Hiph'il* we should expect the *Hoph'al* הִנִּיחָה, which is, no doubt, to be read for הִנִּיחָה in La 5⁵.

Klostermann after the LXX. In Dn 8¹¹ the *Kethibh* הרים is intended for a perfect *Hiph'il*. There is also a distinction in meaning between יָלִין to spend the night, to remain, and יָלִין Ex 16⁷ *Q're* (*Kethibh* הָלֹאנוּ; conversely, verse 2 *Kethibh* יָלִינוּ, *Q're* הָלֹאנוּ), participle מָלִין Ex 16⁸, Nu 14²⁷, 17²⁰, to be stubborn, obstinate: in the latter sense from the form יָלִין only יָלִין is found, Ex 17³. Other examples are *Niph'al* נָפֹול he was circumcised, Gn 17²⁶ f.; participle 34²² (from מָוֹל, not נָמֹל); נָעוֹר he is waked up, Zc 2¹⁷ (see above, v); *Hiph'il* הִנְיֹלה La 1⁸; יָלִיו Pr 4²¹.

ff Perhaps the same explanation applies to some forms of verbs first guttural with *Dageš forte implicitum*, which others derive differently or would emend, e. g. וְתַחַשׁ for וְתַחַשׁ and she hastened (from חוּשׁ) Jb 31⁵; וְנָעַט (another reading is וְנָעַט), וְנָעַט I S 15¹⁹, 25¹⁴ (14⁵² *Q're*) from עָוַט or עָוַט to fly at anything. Both, as far as the form is concerned, would be correct apocopated imperfects from הָשָׂה and עָטָה (לָה), but these stems only occur with a wholly different meaning.

gg 10. Verbs with a consonantal *Wāw* for their second radical, are inflected throughout like the strong form, provided the first or third radical is not a weak letter, e. g. חָוַר, imperfect יַחְוֹר to be white; נָוַע, imperfect יִנְוַע to expire; רָוַח to be wide; צָוַח to cry; *Pi'el* עָוַל, imperfect יַעְוֹל to act wickedly; עָוַת to bend, *Hithpa'el* הִתְעָוַת to bend oneself; and this is especially the case with verbs which are at the same time לָה, e. g. צָוַח, *Pi'el* צָוַח to command, קָנַח to wait, רָוַח to drink, *Pi'el* רָוַח (on אֲרָוִיךָ Is 16⁹, see § 75 dd) and *Hiph'il* הִרְוַח to give to drink, &c.

§ 73. Verbs middle *i* (vulgo ע"י), e. g. בִּין to discern.

Paradigm N.

a 1. These verbs agree, as regards their structure, exactly with verbs ע"י, and in contrast to them may be termed ע"י, or more correctly, *ayin-i* verbs, from the characteristic vowel of the *impf.*, *imper.*, and *inf. constr.* This distinction is justified in so far as it refers to a difference in the pronunciation of the *imperfect* and its kindred forms, the *imperative* and *inf. constr.*—the ע"י verbs having *u* lengthened from original *ü* and ע"י having *i* lengthened from original *ë*. In other respects verbs ע"י simply belong to the class of really monosyllabic stems, which, by a strengthening of their *vocalic* element, have been assimilated to the triliteral form¹ (§ 67 a). In the *perfect Qal* the monosyllabic stem, as in ע"י, has *ā* lengthened from *ā*, thus: שָׁת he has set; *infinitive* שֵׁית, *infinitive absolute* שׁוֹת, *imperative* שֵׁית, *imperfect* יִשֵּׁת, *jussive* יִשֵּׁת (§ 48 g), *imperfect consecutive* וַיִּשֵּׁת.—The *perfect Qal* of some verbs

¹ That verbs ע"י and ע"י are developed from biliteral roots at a period before the differentiation of the Semitic languages is admitted even by Nöldeke (*Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassburg, 1904, p. 34 ff.), although he contests the view that בִּינִית and רִיבֹת are to be referred to *Hiph'il* with the preformative dropped.

used to be treated as having a double set of forms, a regular series, and others like *Hiph'il* without the preformative, e. g. בִּינָתִי Dn 10¹; בִּינָה Dn 9², also בִּנְיָה ψ 139²; רִיבֹתָ thou strivest, Jb 33¹³, also רִבָּה La 3⁵⁸. The above *perfects* (בִּין, רִיב, &c.) might no doubt be taken as forms *middle ē* (properly *i*), the *i* of which has been lengthened to *î* (like the *ũ* lengthened to *û* in the *imperfect Qal* of קים). It is more probable, however, that they are really shortened forms of *Hiph'il*. This is supported by the fact that, especially in the case of בִּין, the shortened forms are few and probably all late, while the corresponding unshortened forms with the same meaning are very numerous, e. g. *perfect* הִבִּין (but בִּין only in Dn 10¹), הִבְיִנְוֹהֶם, *infinitive* הִבִּין (but *infin. abs.* בִּין only in Pr 23¹), *imperative* הִבֵּן (only in Dn 9²³ יִבֵּן immediately before וְהִבֵּן, also בִּינֵי three times, and בִּינָה ψ 5²), *participle* מִבִּין.¹ Elsewhere *Hiph'il*-forms are in use along with actual *Qal*-forms with the same meaning, thus: מִרִּיב (also רִיב), מִשִּׁים placing (but only in Jb 4⁵⁰, which, with the critically untenable הִשִּׁימִי Ez 21²¹, is the only instance of שִׁים in *Hiph'il*), מִגִּיחַ breaking forth Ju 20³³, with *infin. Qal* גִּיחוּ; מִצִּיץ they rushed forth Ju 20³⁷, with חָשַׁח, חִשְׁתִּי, מִצִּיץ glancing, also in *perfect* צָץ הִצִּיא he spat out, with *imperat. Qal* קִי. As *passives* we find a few apparent *imperfects Hoph'al*, which are really (according to § 53 u) *imperfects passive* of *Qal*, e. g. יִחַל Is 66⁸ from חָל to turn round, יוֹשֵׁר from שָׁר to sing, יוֹשֵׁת from שָׁת to set.

2. The above-mentioned *Hiph'il*-forms might equally well be derived *b* from verbs ע; and the influence of the analogy of verbs ע is distinctly seen in the *Niph'al* נָבִין (ground-form *nabân*), *Pôlêl* בּוֹיֵן, and *Hithpôlêl* הִתְבּוֹיֵן. The very close relation existing between verbs ע and ע is evident also from the fact that from some stems both forms occur side by side in *Qal*, thus from חָל to turn round, *imperative* also חוֹלִי Mi 4¹⁰; שִׁים to place, *infinitive construct* commonly שִׁים (2 S 14⁷ שִׁים *Qere*), *imperfect* יִשִּׁים, but Ex 4¹¹ יִשְׂוֹם. In other verbs one form is, at any rate, the more common, e. g. גִּיל to exult (גִּיל only Pr 23²⁴ *Kethûb*); from לָין (perhaps denominative from לָיל) to spend the night, לָלִין occurs six times as *infinitive construct*, לָלִין only in Gn 24²³; but the *imperative* is always לֵן, &c.—Of verbs ע the most common are שָׁת to set, רִיב to strive, דִּין to judge, שִׂישׁ to rejoice; cf. also *perfect* כָּל (middle

¹ Since בִּנְיָה ψ 139² might be intended for בִּנְיָה, there remains really no form of בִּין which must necessarily be explained as a *Qal*, except the *plur. plur.* בִּנְיִים Jer 49⁷. Nevertheless it is highly probable that all the above instances of *Hiph'il*-forms, parallel with *Qal*-forms of the same meaning, are merely due to a secondary formation from the *imperfects Qal* יִבִּין, יִשִּׁים, &c., which were wrongly regarded as *imperfects Hiph'il*: so Barth, *ZDMG.* xliii. p. 190 f, and *Nominalbildung*, p. 119 f.

Yôdh in Arabic) *to comprehend, to measure*, Is 40¹²; עִיט (as in Arabic and Syriac) *to rush upon*, and the denominative perfect קָץ (from קָץ) *to pass the summer*, Is 18⁶. On the other hand, וְיִגְוּ and *they shall fish them*, Jer 16¹⁶, generally explained as *perfect Qal*, denominative from יָגַשׁ *fish*, probably represents a denominative *Pi'êl*, וְיִגְוּ.

c Corresponding to verbs properly ע"ו, mentioned in § 72 gg, there are certain verbs ע"ו with consonantal *Yôdh*, as אָב to *hate*, עָיַף to *faint*, הָיָה to *become, to be*, חָיָה to *live*.

d Rem. 1. In the *perfect Qal* 3rd fem. sing. וְלָנָה occurs once, Zc 5⁴, for וְלָנָה, with the weakening of the toneless *ā* to *ē* (as in the fem. participle וּזְרָה Is 59⁵); cf. the analogous examples in § 48 l and § 80 i.—2nd sing. masc. נִשְׁתָּהּ ψ 90⁸, *Qerê* (before ע; cf. § 72 s); 1st sing. once נִשְׁתִּי ψ 73²⁸, *mū'era'*, without any apparent reason; 1st plur. וְלָנוּ Ju 19¹³ for *lān-nū*. The lengthened *imperative* has the tone on the ultima before gutturals, רִבְּהָ יְהוה ψ 35¹; see further, § 72 s.—Examples of the *infinitive absolute* are: רָב *litigando*, Ju 11²⁵, Jb 4c²; שׁוּם Jer 42¹⁵; שֵׁת *ponendo*, Is 22⁷. On the other hand, יָרִיב (for רָב) Jer 5c³⁴, בֵּין תָּבִין Pr 23¹, חוּל תְּחִיל Ex 30¹⁶ *Keth.*, are irregular and perhaps due to incorrect *scriptio plena*; for the last the *Qerê* requires תְּחִיל, but read חוּל; cf. § 113 x.

e 2. The *shortened imperfect* usually has the form יִשַׁע, יִשֵּׁת, more rarely, with the tone moved back, e.g. יָרַב לוּ Ju 6³¹, cf. Ex 23¹, אֶל-תִּשָּׁע I S 9²⁰. So with *wāw consecutive* וַיִּשַׁע and *he placed*, וַיִּשֵּׁת and *he perceived*; with a middle guttural וַיִּשַׁע בָּהֶם I S 25¹⁴ (see § 72 ee); with ר as 3rd radical, וַיִּשָּׁר Ju 5¹. As *jussive* of לָיוּ, תִּלָּן is found in Ju 19²⁰ (in *pause*) and Jb 17², for תִּלָּן.—For אֶל-תִּרְוּ Pr 3³⁰ *Keth.* (*Qerê* תִּרְוּ) read תִּרְבּ.

f 3. As *participle active Qal* לָיוּ *spending the night*, occurs once, Neh 13²¹; *participle passive* שִׁים Nu 24²¹, I S 9²⁴, Ob 4; *feminine* שׁוּמָה 2 S 13³², in the *Qerê*, even according to the reading of the Oriental schools (see p. 38, note 2): the *Kethibh* has שִׁימָה. A *passive* of *Qal* (cf. above, § 52 e and s, and § 53 u) from שִׁים may perhaps be seen in וַיִּשִּׁם Gn 5c²⁶ (also Gn 24³³ *Kethibh* וַיִּשֵּׁם, *Qerê* וַיִּשַׁם); the Samaritan in both places has וַיִּשַׁם, and also in יִסְקָה Ex 3c³², Samaritan יוֹסֵק. Against the explanation of יוֹסֵק as a *Hoph'al*-form from יוֹסֵק, Barth (*Jubelschrift . . . Hildesheimer*, Berlin, 1890, p. 151) rightly urges that the only example of a *Hiph'il* of יוֹסֵק is the doubtful יוֹסֵק, which is probably an *î-imperfect* of *Qal*.—The explanation of יוֹשֵׁם, &c., as a *passive* of *Qal* arising from *yŷysam*, &c. = *yuyysam* (so Barth, *ibid.*, note 1), is certainly also unconvincing, so that the correctness of the traditional reading is open to question.

* * * * *

g 4. In verbs ע"ו the ע always retains its consonantal value; these stems are, therefore, to be regarded as verbs *middle Guttural* (§ 64). An exception is נָאֵן Ec 12⁵ if it be *imperfect Hiph'il* of נָאֵן (for נָאֵן); but if the form has really been correctly transmitted, it should rather be referred to נָאֵן, and regarded as incorrectly written for נָאֵן. On נָאֵן (from נָאֵן), which was formerly treated here as ע"ו, see now § 75 x.

§ 74. Verbs נ"ל, e.g. מצ׳ to find. Paradigm O.

The נ in these verbs, as in verbs נ"ד, is treated in some cases as *a* a consonant, i.e. as a guttural, in others as having no consonantal value (as a quiescent or vowel letter), viz.:

1. In those forms which terminate with the נ, the final syllable always has the regular vowels, if long, e.g. מצ׳, מצ׳, מצ׳, מצ׳, מצ׳, i.e. the נ simply quiesces in the long vowel, without the latter suffering any change whatever. It is just possible that after the altogether heterogeneous vowel *ā* the נ may originally have preserved a certain consonantal value. On the other hand, if the final נ quiesces in a preceding *ā* (as in the *perfect*, *imperfect*, and *imperative Qal*, in the *perfect Niph'al*, and in *Pu'al* and *Hoph'al*) this *ā* is necessarily lengthened to *ā*, by § 27 g, as standing in an open syllable; e.g. מצ׳, מצ׳, &c.

The *imperfect* and *imperative Qal* invariably have *ā* in the final syllable, on *b* the analogy of verbs *tertiæ gutturalis*; cf., however, § 76 e.—In the *imperfect Hithpa'el* *ā* occurs in the final syllable not only (according to § 54 k) in the principal pause (Nu 31¹³), or immediately before it (Jb 10¹⁵), or with the lesser disjunctives (Lv 21¹⁻⁴, Nu 19^{13,20}), but even out of pause with *Mer'kha*, Nu 6⁷, and even before *Magqeph* in Nu 19¹².

2. When נ stands at the end of a syllable before an affirmative *c* beginning with a consonant (ת, נ), it likewise quiesces with the preceding vowel; thus in the *perfect Qal* (and *Hoph'al*, see below) quiescing with *ā* it regularly becomes *Qames* (מצ׳ for מצ׳, &c.); but in the *perfect* of all the other active and reflexive conjugations, so far as they occur, it is preceded by *Sere* (נמצ׳, &c.), and in the *imperative* and *imperfect* by *S'ghôl*, נמצ׳, נמצ׳.

(a) The *S'ghôl* of these forms of the *imperfect* and *imperative* might be *d* considered as a modification, and at the same time a lengthening of an original *ā* (see § 8 a). In the same way the *ē* of the *perfect* forms in *Pi'el*, *Hithpa'el*, and *Hiph'il* might be traced to an original *i* (as in other cases the *ē* and *i* in the final syllable of the 3rd *sing. masc. perfect* of these conjugations), although this *i* may have only been attenuated from an original *ā*. According to another, and probably the correct explanation, however, both the *Sere* and the *S'ghôl* are due to the analogy of verbs נ"ל (§ 75 f) in consequence of the close relation between the two classes, cf. § 75 *nn*.—No form of this kind occurs in *Pu'al*; in the *perfect Hoph'al* only the 2nd *masc. sing.* הַבְּאִתָּה Ez 40⁴, lengthened according to rule.

(b) Before suffixes attached by a connecting vowel (e.g. יִקְרָאֵנִי) the נ *c* retains its consonantal value; so before ך and ך, e.g. יִמְצָאֵךְ Ct 8¹; יִבְרָאֵךְ Ez 28¹³ (cf. § 65 k), not יִמְצָאֵךְ, &c., since these suffixes, by § 58 f, are likewise attached to the verb-form by a connecting vowel in the form of *S'wā mobile*.—As *infinitive Qal* with suffix notice יִמְצָאֵךְ Ez 25⁶; *participle* with suffix יִבְרָאֵךְ Is 43¹; *infinitive Pi'el* בְּמִצְאֵךְ.—The doubly anomalous form יִקְרָאֵנִי Jer 23⁶ (for יִקְרָאֵנִי or יִקְרָאֵנִי) is perhaps a *forma mixta* combining the readings יִקְרָאֵנִי and יִקְרָאֵנִי.

f 3. When א begins a syllable (consequently before affirmatives which consist of or begin with a vowel, as well as before suffixes) it is necessarily a firm consonant, and the form then follows the analogy of the strong verb, e.g. מַצָּאָה *māṣṣāʾ*, מַצָּאִי, &c. (in pause מַצָּאָה, מַצָּאִי).

REMARKS.

g 1. Verbs *middle e*, like מָלֵא *to be full*, retain the *Sere* also in the other persons of the *perfect*, e.g. מָלֵאתִי (מָלֵאתִי Est 7⁵ has — owing to its transitive use; for יִרְאֶתֶם Jos 4²⁴ read with Ewald יִרְאֶתֶם). Instead of מַצָּאָה the form קִרְאָה *she names*, on the analogy of the ל"ה-forms noticed in § 75 *m*, occurs in Is 7¹⁴ (from קִרְאָה, cf. § 44 *f*), and with a different meaning (*it befalls*) in Dt 31²⁹, Jer 44²³, in both places before א, and hence, probably, to avoid a hiatus (on the other hand, וְהִטָּאתִי Ex 5¹⁶, could only be the 2nd *sing. masc.*; the text which is evidently corrupt should probably be emended to וְהִטָּאתִי with the LXX); in *Niph'al* נִפְלֵאתָ ψ 118²³; in *Hoph'al* הִבָּאת Gn 33¹¹.—The 2nd *fem. sing.* is written קִרְאָתִי by Baer, Gen 16¹¹, &c., according to early MSS.

h 2. The *infinitive Qal* occurs sometimes on the analogy of verbs ל"ה (גִּלְתִּי, &c., see § 75 *nn*) in the feminine form; so always מָלֵאת *to fill* (as distinguished from מָלֵא *fullness*), Lv 8³³, 12^{4,6}, 25³⁰, Jer 29¹⁰, Ez 5², also written מִלְאוֹת Jer 25¹², Jb 20²², &c., and מְלֹאת Est 1⁵. Cf. further, קִרְאָה Ju 8¹; שְׁנֵאת Pr 8¹³; before suffixes, Ez 33¹², and likewise in *Niph.* זִע 13⁴; also in *Piel* לְמִלְאָה Ex 31⁵, 35³³, or לְמִלְאוֹת Dn 9², &c. *Kethibh*; with suffix 2 S 21².—On the (aramaizing) *infinitives* מִשָּׂא and מִשְׁאוֹת, see § 45 *e*; on לְקִרְאָתִי *obviam*, § 19 *k*.—בְּמִצָּאֵכֶם *when ye find*, Gn 32²⁰, stands, according to § 93 *g*, for מִצָּאֵכֶם. The tone of the lengthened *imperative* רִפְּאֵה Ps 41⁵ as *Miṣra'* (before נִפְּשִׁי) is to be explained on rhythmical grounds; cf. the analogous cases in § 72 *s*.—The 2nd *fem. plur. imperative* in Ru 1⁹ has, according to Qimḥi, the form מַצָּאִי and in verse 20 קִרְאִי; on the other hand, the Mantua edition and Ginsburg, on good authority, read מַצָּאִי, קִרְאִי.

i 3. The *participle fem.* is commonly contracted, e.g. מַצָּאת (for מַצָּאֶת) 2 S 18²², cf. Est 2¹⁵; so *Niph'al* נִפְלֵאת Dt 30¹¹, Zc 5⁷ (but נִשְׁאָה Is 30²⁶), and *Hoph'al*, Gn 38²⁵; less frequent forms are מוֹצֵאת Ct 8¹⁰; נִשְׁאָת 1 K 10²² (cf. § 76 *b*, שָׁאת beside לִשְׁאָת as *infinitive construct* from נִשָּׂא) and without א (see *k*) יוֹצֵת (from יוֹצֵא) Dt 28⁵⁷. In the forms הַטָּאִים *sinning*, 1 S 14³³, cf. ψ 99⁶; בִּרְאָם *feigning them*, Neh 6⁸, the א is elided, and is only retained orthographically (§ 23 *c*) after the retraction of its vowel; see the analogous cases in § 75 *oo*.—On the *plur. masc. ptcp. Niph.* cf. § 93 *oo*.

k 4. Frequently an א which is quiescent is omitted in writing (§ 23 *f*): (a) in the middle of the word, e.g. בָּנִי 1 S 25⁸; מִצָּתִי Nu 11¹¹, cf. Jb 1²¹; צִמְתִּי Ju 4¹⁹, cf. Jb 32¹⁸. In the *imperfect* תִּשְׁנֶה Jer 9¹⁷, Zc 5⁹, Ru 1¹⁴ (but the same form occurs with *Yódh* pleonastic after the manner of verbs ל"ה in Ez 23⁴⁹, according to the common reading; cf. § 76 *b* and Jer 50²⁰); in *Piel* אֶחְטֶנָּה (after elision of the א, cf. § 75 *oo*) Gn 31³⁹; and also in *Niph'al* נִשְׁמַתֶּם Lv 11⁴³; cf. Jos 2¹⁶. (b) at the end of the word; וַיָּבֵי 1 K 12¹² *Kethibh*; *Hiph'il* הִחְיֵי 2 K 13⁶, cf. Is 53¹⁰ (הִחְיֵי for הִחְיֵי *perfect Hiph'il* of חָיָה formed

after the manner of verbs ל"ה; in the *imperfect* *Hiph'il* יִשִּׁי ψ 55¹⁶ *Kethibh*; יָיִ ψ 141⁵; אָבִי 1 K 21¹⁹, Mi 1¹⁵; in the *infinitive*, Jer 32³⁵; in the *participle*, 2 S 5², 1 K 21²¹, Jer 19¹⁵, 39⁶, all in *Kethibh* (כָּבִי, always before ל, hence perhaps only a scribal error).

5. In the *jussive*, *imperfect consecutive*, and *imperative* *Hiph'il* a number of cases occur with ה in the final syllable; cf. יִשִּׁי Is 36¹⁴ (in the parallel passages 2 K 18²⁹, 2 Ch 32¹⁵ יִשִּׁי); וְיָבִיא Neh 8² (before ו); וְיִתְחַטֵּא 2 K 21¹¹ (cf. 1 K 16², 21²²); וְיִתְחַבֵּא = K 6²⁹; וְיִזְעַק Dt 4²⁰, 2 K 11¹², ψ 78¹⁶, 105⁴³; *imperative* הִבֵּי Jer 17¹⁸; הוֹצֵא Is 43⁸ (in both cases before ו). If the tradition be correct (which at least in the defectively written forms appears very doubtful) the retention of the ה is to be attributed to the open syllable; while in the closed syllable of the 3rd *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, and the 2nd *sing. masc.* after ו *consecutive*, the ה is always reduced to e. In the examples before ו considerations of euphony may also have had some influence (cf. § 75 hh).—In Ez 40³, Baer reads with the Western school וְיָבִיא, while the Orientals read in the *Kethibh* ויבוא, and in the *Qere* ויבא.

On the transition of verbs ל"ה to forms of ל"ה see § 75 nn.

§ 75. Verbs ל"ה, e.g. גָּלָה to reveal. Paradigm P.

Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 149 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 618 ff.—G. R. Berry, 'Original Waw in ל"ה verbs' in *AJSL*. xx. 256 f.

These verbs, like the verbs פָּ"י (§§ 69, 70), belong to two different *a* classes, viz. those originally ל"ו and those originally ל"י,¹ which in Arabic, and even more in Ethiopic, are still clearly distinguished. In Hebrew, instead of the original ו or י at the end of the word, a ה always appears (except in the *ptcp. pass. Qal*) as a purely orthographic indication of a final vowel (§ 23 k); hence both classes are called ל"ה, e.g. גָּלָה for גָּלִי *he has revealed*; שָׁלָה for שָׁלִי *he has rested*. By far the greater number of these verbs are, however, treated as originally ל"י; only isolated forms occur of verbs ל"ו.

שָׁלָה to be at rest may be recognized as originally ל"י, in the forms in which ה the Waw appears as a strong consonant, cf. 1st *sing. perfect Qal* שָׁלֹחִי Jb 3²⁶, the *participle* שָׁלֹחַ and the derivative שִׁלְחָה *rest*; on the other hand the *imperfect* is יִשְׁלֹחֵי (with *Yôdh*). In עָנָה (Arab. عَنِ to answer, and עָנָה (Arab. عَنُو)² to be afflicted, are to be seen two verbs originally distinct, which have been assimilated in Hebrew (see the *Lexicon*, s. v. עָנָה).

¹ According to Wellhausen, 'Ueber einige Arten schwacher Verba' in his *Skizzen*, vi. p. 255 ff., the ל"ה verbs, apart from some true ל"ו and some probable ל"י, are to be regarded as originally biliteral. To compensate for their arrested development they lengthened the vowel after the 2nd radical, as the ל"ו verbs did after the 1st radical. But although there is much to be said for this view, it fails to explain pausal forms like הִתְחַבֵּא (see u). It seems impossible that these should all be late formations.

² In the *Mēša'* inscription, line 5, ויענו and he oppressed occurs as 3rd *sing. masc. imperfect Piel*, and in line 6, אענו I will oppress as 1st *sing.*

Of quite a different class are those verbs of which the third radical is a *consonantal ה* (distinguished by *Mappiq*). These are inflected throughout like verbs *tertiæ gutturalis*. Cf. § 65 note on the heading.

c The grammatical structure of verbs ה"ל (see Paradigm P) is based on the following laws:—

1. In all forms in which the original *Yôdh* or *Wāw* would stand at the end of the word, it is dropped (cf. § 24 g) and ה takes its place as an orthographic indication of the preceding long vowel. Such an indication would have been indispensable, on practical grounds, in the still unvocalized consonantal text. But even after the addition of the vowel signs, the orthographic rule remained, with insignificant exceptions (see § 8 k, and אָלְהֵם, &c.), that a final vowel must be indicated by a vowel letter. In verbs ה"ל the ה which is here employed as a vowel letter is preceded by the same vowel in the same part of the verb throughout all the conjugations. Thus the endings are—

ה־ in all perfects, אָלְה, נִנְלְה, אֵלְה, &c.

ה־ in all imperfects and participles, יִנְלְה, אֵלְה, &c.

ה־ in all imperatives, אֵלְה, אֵלְה, &c.

ה־ in the infinitive absolute (אֵלְה, &c.), except in *Hiph'el*, *Hoph'al*, and generally also *Pi'el*, see aa and ff.

The *participle passive Qal* alone forms an exception, the original י (or ו, see v) reappearing at the end, אֵלְי; and so also some derived nouns (§ 84^a, c, e, &c.).

The *infinitive construct* always has the ending וְה (with ת *feminine*); *Qal* אֵלְוְה, *Pi'el* אֵלְוְה, &c.; for exceptions, see n and y.

d These forms may be explained as follows:—in the *perfect Qal* אֵלְה stands, according to the above, for (י)אֵלְה, and, similarly, in *Niph'al*, *Pu'al*, and *Hoph'al*. The *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* may be based on the forms אֵלְה, אֵלְה (§ 52 l; and § 54 k), and *Hiph'el* on the form אֵלְה, on the analogy of the אֵלְה in the second syllable of the Arabic 'aqtālū (§ 53 a). Perhaps, however, the final אֵלְה of these conjugations simply follows the analogy of the other conjugations.

e The explanation of the final tone-bearing ה־ of the *imperfect* is still a matter of dispute. As to the various treatments of it, see Barth, *Nominalbildung*, i. p. xxx ff, with § 136, Rem., and ZDMG. xlv. 695 f., against Philippi's objections in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, 1890, p. 356 f.; also ZDMG. lvi. 244, where Barth appeals to the rule that, in the period before the differentiation of the North Semitic dialects, final *iy* becomes ה־ (*constr.* ה־), not י; M. Lambert, *Journ. Asiat.* 1893, p. 285; Prætorius, ZDMG. lv. 365. The most probable explanation now seems to be, first, that the uniform pronunciation of all imperfects and participles with *S^eghol* in the last syllable merely follows the analogy of the *impf. Qal*, and secondly, that the *S^eghol* of the *impf. Qal* does perhaps ultimately represent a contraction of the original termination י־ (= ai), although elsewhere (e.g. in the *imperative* of ה"ל) ai is usually contracted to ē.

2. When the original *Yôdh* stands at the end of the syllable before *f* an affirmative beginning with a consonant (ה, נ) there arises (a) in the *perfects*, primarily the diphthong *ai* (אֵי). In the middle of the word this ought always to be contracted to *ê* (אֵ), but this *ê* is only found consistently in the passive conjugations, whilst regularly in *Qal*, and frequently in the other active and reflexive conjugations (especially in *Pi'êl*), it appears as *i* (cf. *x*, *z*, *ee*). This *i*, however, in the *perf.* *Qal* is not to be explained as a weakening of an original *ê*, but as the original vowel of the *intransitive* form. It then became usual also in the *transitive* forms of *Qal* (and in some other conjugations on this analogy), whereas e.g. in Syriac the two kinds of forms are still carefully distinguished.—(b) In the *imperfects* and *imperatives*, אֶ with the tone always appears before the affirmative הָ. On the most probable explanation of this אֶ, see above, e.

Summary. Accordingly before affirmatives beginning with a consonant the principal vowel is—

In the perfect *Qal* *i*, e.g. הָלַיְתָ;

In the perfects of the other active and reflexive conjugations, sometimes *ê*, sometimes *i*, הָלַיְתָ and הָלַיְתָ; הָלַיְתָ and הָלַיְתָ;

In the perfects passive always *ê*, e.g. הָלַיְתָ;

In the imperfects and imperatives always אֶ, e.g. הָלַיְתָ, הָלַיְתָ.

The diphthongal forms have been systematically retained in Arabic and Ethiopic; only as an exception and in the popular language is the diphthong contracted. In Aramaic the contracted forms predominate, yet the Syriac, for example, has in *Qal* 2nd pers. sing. *g'elait* (but 1st pers. sing. הָלַיְתָ), and so too the Western Aramaic הָלַיְתָ, but also הָלַיְתָ.

3. Before the vocalic affirmatives (י, אֶ, הָ) the *Yôdh* is usually *h* dropped altogether, e.g. הָלַיְתָ (ground-form *gālāyā*), הָלַיְתָ, *participle fem.* הָלַיְתָ, *plur. masc.* הָלַיְתָ; yet the old full forms also not infrequently occur, especially in *pause*, see *u*. The elision of the *Yôdh* takes place regularly before *suffixes*, e.g. הָלַיְתָ (see *u*).

4. In the 3rd sing. fem. perfect, the original feminine ending הָ was appended to the stem; hence, after elision of the *Yôdh*, arose properly forms like הָלַיְתָ, with *ā* in the final syllable with the tone. This form, however, has been but rarely preserved (see below, *m*). The analogy of the other forms had so much influence, that the common ending הָ was added pleonastically to the ending הָ. Before the הָ the vowel of the ending הָ, which thus loses the tone, becomes *šewā*, and thus there arise such forms as הָלַיְתָ, הָלַיְתָ, &c. (but in *pause* הָלַיְתָ, &c.).

For similar cases see § 70 d; § 91 m.

k 5. Finally, a strongly-marked peculiarity of verbs ה"ל is the rejection of the ending ה־ in forming the *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive*. This shortening occurs in all the conjunctions, and sometimes also involves further changes in the vocalization (see *o*, *y*, *bb*, *gg*). Similarly, in some conjugations a *shortened imperative* (cf. § 48 *k*) is formed by *apocope* of the final ה־ (see *cc*, *gg*).

l 6. The ordinary form of the *imperfect* with the ending ה־ serves in verbs ה"ל to express the cohortative also (§ 48 *c*); cf. Gn 1²⁶, 2¹⁸, 2 Ch 25¹⁷, &c. With a final ה־ there occur only: in *Qal*, שָׁעָה ψ 119¹¹⁷, אֶהְיֶה (with the ' retained, see below, *u*) ψ 77⁴; and in *Hithpa'el* וְנִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה Is 41²³ (with *Tiphḥa*, therefore in lesser pause).

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

m 1. The older form of the *fem.* of the 3rd *sing. perf.* גָּלַת, mentioned above, under *i* (cf. § 74 *g*), is preserved in עָשִׂת (before א) Lv 25²¹ (cf. 2 K 9³⁷ *Kethibh*)¹; likewise in *Hiph'il* הִרְצֵת (before א) Lv 26³⁴; הִלָּאת Ez 24¹²; and in *Hoph'al* הִנְלֵת (before י) Jer 13¹⁹.—The 2nd *sing. fem.* is also written יָת־; thus in the *textus receptus* וְהָיִית 2 S 14², and always in Baer's editions (since 1872), as in most other verbs; הָיִית Is 57⁸; עָשִׂית Jer 2²³, Ez 16⁴⁸, &c. (so וְהָיִצְאתָ 1 K 17¹³ from יָצָא). In the 3rd *pers. plur.* the tone, instead of keeping its usual place (גָּלַת, &c.), is retracted in ψ 37²⁰, בָּלוּ, both on account of the *pause* and also in *rhythmical antithesis* to the preceding בָּלוּ; also in Is 16⁸ תָּעִי (according to Delitzsch for the sake of the assonance with נָתַעִי); and in Jb 24¹ הָיוּ.—On the tone of the *perfect consecutive* see § 49 *k*.

n 2. The *infinitive absol.* frequently has ה־ (probably a survival of the older orthography) for ה־, e. g. הָיוּ Gn 18¹⁸; עָשׂוּ Jer 4¹⁸, &c., Ez 31¹¹; קָנוּ 2 S 24²⁴; רָאוּ Gn 26²⁸, Is 6⁹ (cf. 1 S 6¹²), &c., beside רָאָה. The form שָׁתוּ Is 22¹³ (beside שָׁתוּ in the same verse) appears to have been chosen on account of its similarity in sound to שָׁחַט; so in Is 42²⁰ *Qerê* and Ho 10⁴, אָלוּת (unless it is a substantive, *oaths*) and בָּרַת; cf. also עָרוּת Hb 3¹³.—Conversely, instead of the *infinitive construct* גָּלוּת such forms are occasionally found as גָּלוּה or גָּלוּ, cf. רָאָה Gn 48¹¹; קָנָה Pr 16¹⁶; עָשָׂה Gn 50²⁰, ψ 101⁸, also עָשׂוּ Gn 31²⁸ (cf. Pr 31⁴), and even with the *suffix* הָ the very remarkable form עָשָׂהוּ Ex 18¹⁸.²—The feminine form רָאוּה (for רָאוּת) Ez 28¹⁷, analogous to nouns like גָּאוּה (cf. § 45 *d*), is strange, but הָיָה as *infinitive* Ez 21¹⁵ is quite inexplicable.—The forms הָיוּ and הָיוּ Is 59¹³ are perhaps to be regarded with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, § 51 *a*, as *infinitives absolute of the passive of Qal* (see above, § 53 *u*), not of *Pô'el*.—The 2nd *sing. masc. imperative* וְהָיָה occurs in the principal pause in Pr 4⁴ and 7²; but

¹ In the Siloam inscription also (see above, § 2 *d*), line 3, הִית may be read הִית quite as well as הִית[ה].

² All these infinitives construct in *ô*, in the Pentateuch, belong to the document called E; cf. § 69 *m*, second note.

probably these forms are simply to be attributed to a Masoretic school, which in general marked the difference between certain forms by the use of *è* for *e*, and conversely *e* for *è*; cf. the analogous examples in § 52 n, and especially § 75 hh, also Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 17, 2, Rem. 1.—On the reading וַיִּרְאֵיהֶם Ct 3¹¹ (for וַיִּרְאֵיהֶם, on the analogy of the reading מִצָּאָה, &c., § 74 h), see Baer's note on the passage.

3. The shortening of the imperfect (see above, k, and the note on hh) occasions O in Qal the following changes:

(a) As a rule the first radical takes a helping *S^eghôl*, or, if the second radical is a guttural, a helping *Pathah* (according to § 28 e). Thus יָגֵל for יִגְלֵ; וַיָּבוּ and he despised, Gn 25³⁴; וַיִּבְנוּ and he built; יֵשֶׁע he looks; וַיִּמָּח and he destroyed, Gn 7²³.

(b) The *î* of the preformative is then sometimes lengthened to *ē*, e.g. יָרָא *p* he sees. This, however, mostly happens only after the preformative ה, whilst after י the homogeneous *î* remains, e.g. וַיִּתְּבֵל (but יִתְּבֵל), וַיִּתְּפֵן (but יִתְּפֵן), וַיִּתְּרֵב (but יִתְּרֵב); with middle guttural וַיִּתְּחַע, וַיִּתְּכָה Jb 17⁷ (from בָּתָּה). The unusual position of the tone in וַיִּתְּרָא Ze 9⁵, וַיִּתְּרָא Mi 7¹⁰ (so Baer and Ginsb.; ed. Mant. יִרְאָה, וַיִּרְאָה) is best explained (except in יִרְאָה Gn 41⁸³, before פ) on the analogy of קִימָה, &c., § 72 s, as due to the following נ. But cf. also hh.

(c) The helping vowel is elsewhere not used under the circumstances mentioned in § 28 d; וַיִּשָּׁב Nu 21¹, Jer 41¹⁰, cf. וַיִּפְתָּ Jb 31²⁷; on the other hand, with *î* lengthened into *ē* (see p) וַיִּשְׁתָּה, וַיִּבְרַךְ, וַיִּרְדָּה, וַיִּשְׁטָה. The form יָרָא he sees, occurs parallel with וַיִּרְאָה and he saw (but 3rd fem. always וַיִּתְּרָא), the latter with the original *Pathah* on account of the following ר, and identical with the 3rd sing. masc. of the imperf. consec. *Hiph'il*, 2 K 11⁴.

(d) Examples of verbs *primae gutturalis* (§ 63), and at the same time ל"ה, ר are וַיַּעֲשֶׂה, in pause וַיַּעֲשֶׂה and he made, from עָשָׂה; וַיַּעֲנֶה and he answered, from עָנָה (always identical with the corresponding forms in *Hiph'il*), וַיַּחֲצֵן and he divided, from חָצָה. On some similar forms of נ"פ see § 76 d.—In the following cases the initial (hard) guttural does not affect the form: וַיִּזְחַר and he was wroth, וַיַּחֲזֵן and he encamped (3rd plur. וַיַּחֲזֵנוּ), וַיַּחֲדֵךְ (with *Dageš lene* and *Šewā*) let it rejoice, Jb 3⁶; cf. Ex 18⁹.—On וַיִּזְ, וַיִּזְ, וַיִּזְ (ל"ה) as well as וַיַּפְ, &c., see § 76 b, c, f.

(e) The verbs הָיָה to be, and חָיָה to live, of which the shortened imperfects *S* ought to be *yihy* and *yihy*, change these forms to יָהִי and יָחִי, the second *Yôdh* being resolved into *i* at the end of the word; but in pause (§ 29 n) יָהִי, יָחִי, with the original *ā* modified to *S^eghôl* with the tone (cf. also nouns like בָּכִי for *bakhhy*, in pause בָּכִי עָנִי; וַיַּעֲנֵי for *ōny*, &c., § 84^a c, and § 93 x). For תָּשִׁי, however, in Dt 32¹⁸, since no verb תָּשִׂיה exists, we must read either תָּשָׁה, or better תָּשָׂה (Samaritan תָּשָׂה), as imperfect Qal of נָשָׂה to forget.—Analogous to יָהִי from הָיָה, there occurs once, from חָיָה to be, the form יָהוּא for יָהִי he will be, Ec 11³, but no doubt הוּא is the right reading.

The full forms (without apocope of the ה, cf. § 49 c) not infrequently *t* occur after *wāw* consecutive, especially in the 1st pers. and in the later books, e.g. וַיִּרְאֵהָ and I saw, twenty times, and Jos 7²¹ in *K^ethibh*, but never in the Pentateuch (וַיִּרְאֵהָ fifteen times, of which three are in the Pent.); also in the

3rd pers. **וַיַּעַשׂ** Ez 18²⁸, Jb 42¹⁶ *Q^{re}*; **וַיַּעַשׂ** and *he made*, four times (but **וַיַּעַשׂ** over 200 times); cf. also Ju 19² (**וַתַּעֲשֶׂה**); 1 K 10²⁹ (**וַתַּעֲשֶׂה**); Dt 1¹⁶ (**וַתַּעֲשֶׂה**), and Gn 24⁴³. So also occasionally for the *jussive*, cf. Gn 1⁹, 41³⁴, Jer 28⁶.—For the well attested, but meaningless **תִּירָא** Jb 6²¹ (doubtless caused by the following **וַתִּירָא**), read **תִּירָא** *ye see*, with Ginsburg.

u 4. The original *y* sometimes appears even before affirmatives beginning with a vowel (cf. above, *h* and *l*), especially in and before the *pause*, and before the full plural ending **וְ**—, or where for any reason an emphasis rests on the word. *Perfect* **הָעָיָה** ψ 57², **הָעָיָה** Dt 32³⁷, cf. ψ 73² *Q^{re}*; *imperative* **בָּעֵי** Is 21¹². *Imperfect* **יֵאָתִי** Jb 16²², 30¹⁴ (without the *pause*, ψ 68³²); **יֵשְׁלִי** ψ 122⁶, Jb 12⁶, cf. ψ 77⁴; **יִרְבֵּי** Dt 8¹³; ψ 36⁹: more frequently like **יִשְׁתַּיִן** ψ 78⁴⁴; Is 17¹², 21¹², 26¹¹, 31³, 33⁷, 41⁵, ψ 36⁸, 39⁷, 83³; before a suffix, Jb 3²⁶. Also in Pr 26⁷ **דָּלִי**, as *perf. Qal* from **דָּלָה**, was perhaps originally intended, but hardly **דָּלִי**, since these full forms, though they may stand out of *pause*, do not begin sentences; **דָּלִי** probably points to **דָּלָה** from **דָּלָל** as the right reading, since the sense requires an intransitive verb. Cf. further, *v*, *x*, *dd*, *gg*.

U 5. The *participle active* (cf. Volders, 'Das Qatil-Partizipium,' ZA. 1903, p. 312 ff., and on the participles of **ל"**, *ibid.*, p. 316 ff.), besides feminine forms like **עֹלָה** Ju 20³¹, &c., **רֹאָה** Pr 20¹², has also a *feminine* which retains the 3rd radical *y*, viz. **בֹּכֶיָה** (= **בָּכָה**) *weeping*, La 1¹⁶; **הוֹמֶיָה** *tumultuous*, Is 22² (*plur.* Pr 1²¹); **צוֹפֶיָה** *spying*, Pr 31²⁷; **פְּרִיָה** *fruitful*, ψ 128³, *plur.* **אֲתִיּוֹת** *the things that are to come*, Is 41²³. With the ordinary strong inflexion *y* appears in **עֹמֶיָה** Ct 1⁷, but perhaps there also **עֹמֶיָה** was intended, unless it should be **מְעִיָה** *a wanderer*. For **רֹאָנִי** Is 47¹⁰, **רֹאָנִי** is to be read.—On **עֹשֶׂה** 1 K 20⁴⁰ for **עֹשֶׂה**, cf. § 116 *g*, note.—In the *participle passive* the 3rd radical still sometimes appears as *y* (§ 24 *b*), cf. **עָשׂוּ** *made*, Jb 41²⁵, **צָפוּ** Jb 15²², contracted from **עָשׂוּ**, **צָפוּ**; and before a formative ending, it even has its consonantal sound, **הַעֲשׂוּם** (read **הַעֲשׂוּם**) 2 K 23⁴; **עֲשׂוּת** (read *"asûwoth*) 1 S 25¹⁸ *Kethibh*, **נְטוּת** (read *n^etûwoth*) Is 3¹⁶ *Kethibh*. The shortening of the *û* in **רֹאִיּוֹת** Est 2⁹ is irregular.

W 6. The defective writing is rare in such forms as **וְהָיָה** 2 S 15³³; **בָּנִיתִי** 1 K 8⁴⁴, cf. 1 K 9³; **וְהִתְלַכְנָה** Ex 2¹⁶ (cf. Jer 18²¹, 48⁶, 1 Ch 7¹⁵, Jb 17⁵, &c.), and the pronunciation **הִתְלַכְנָה** Mi 7¹⁰, cf. **הִתְעַנְנָה** Ju 5²⁹ (unless they are *sing.* with *suff.* of the 3rd *sing. fem.*). Both cases are probably to be explained according to § 20 *i*.

II. On Niph'al.

X 7. Here the forms with **י** in the 1st and 2nd pers. *sing.* of the *perfect* predominate (**י**— only in **נִשְׁתִּיתִי** Gn 24⁸); on the other hand in the 1st *plur.* always **י**—, as **נִנְלֵנוּ** 1 S 14⁸. No examples of the 2nd *plur.* occur.—With *y* retained in *pause* **נִפְּטִי** Nu 24⁶; once with an initial guttural **נִחְרוּ** Ct 1⁶ for **נִחְרוּ**, probably arising from the ordinary strong form *nihru*, but the harshness of **ח** immediately followed by **ר** is avoided by pronouncing the **ח** with *Haṭeph-Pathah*.—In the 3rd *sing. fem.* **נִשְׁתַּתָּה** Pr 27¹⁵ (in *pause* for **נִשְׁתַּתָּה**) **ו** and **ח** may be transposed for euphonic reasons; but probably we should simply read **נִשְׁתַּתָּה**.—Among Niph'al forms of **ל"** must be classed, with Buxtorf and

others (cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* xxx. 185), נִאֲוָה from נֹאֲוָה, not Pi'el of נֹאֲוָה = נֹאֲוָה; hence, according to § 23 d, נִאֲוָה they are beautiful (for נֹאֲוָה) Is 52⁷, Ct 1¹⁰; but in ψ 93⁵, where Baer requires נִאֲוָה, read נֹאֲוָה with ed. Mant., Ginsb.

8. The apocope of the imperfect causes no further changes beyond the rejection *y* of the ה, e.g. יִנְלֵל from יִנְלֵלָה; in one verb middle guttural, however, a form occurs with the Qames shortened to Pathah, viz. יִפַח (for יִפַחַ) ψ 109¹³, as in verbs עָע; but in pause פִּפַח verse 14. Cf. bb.—The infinitive absolute נִנְלֹת emphasizing an infinitive construct, 2 S 6²⁰, is very extraordinary; probably it is a subsequent correction of an erroneous repetition of הנִלֹת.—The infin. constr. לְהִרְאֶה occurs in Ju 13²¹, 1 S 3²¹ for לְהִרְאֶת; cf. above, n.—On the infinitive Niph'al with the ה elided, see § 51 l.—The irregular הִעֲלִי Ez 36³ has probably arisen from a combination of the readings הִעֲלִי (Qal) and הִעֲלִי (Niph'al). Similarly the solecism נִמְכֹּה 1 S 15⁹ might be due to a combination of the participle fem. Niph'al (נִמְכֹּה, cf. נִחֲלָה, נִחֲפָה, נִנְעֶשָׁה) with the Hoph'al (מְכֹה); but it is more correct, with Wellhausen, to explain the מ from a confusion with נָמַס and to read, in fact, נִבֹּה וְנִמְאָסָת.

III. On Pi'el, Pô'el, Pu'al, and Hithpa'el.

9. In the 1st and 2nd persons of the perfect Pi'el the second syllable in *z* most of the instances has ' on the analogy of Qal (see f), as קִיִּיתִי, דִּפְיִיתִי; always so in the first plur., and before suffixes, e.g. דְּבִיתָנוּ Gn 37²⁶, קִפְּיָנוּ ψ 44²⁰. The form with ' is found only in the 1st sing. (e.g. Jo 4²¹; Is 5⁴, 8¹⁷ along with the form with i). On the tone of the perf. consec. Pi'el of ה', see § 49 k.—Hithpa'el has (besides ' Jer 17¹⁶) as a rule ' (Pr 24¹⁰, 1 K 2²⁸, Jer 50²⁴). On the other hand, Pu'al always has ' , e.g. עֲשִׂיתִי ψ 139¹⁵.—A 1st sing. perfect Pô'el שׁוֹשִׁיתִי (= שׁוֹחִיתִי) occurs in Is 10¹³.

10. The infinitive absolute Pi'el takes the form כִּיָּה (like קִטֵּל, the more *aa* frequent form even in the strong verb, see § 52 o); with *ô* only in ψ 40² כִּיָּה; with *ôth* Hb 3¹³ עָרוֹת (cf. above, n). On הָרוּ and הָגוּ, infinitives absolute of the passive of Qal, not of Pô'el, see above, n.—As infinitive construct חִבִּי occurs in Pi'el, Ho 6⁹ (only orthographically different from חִבֵּה, if the text is correct); לְכַלֵּא Dn 9²⁴ (on the כ see rr); עַד-לְכַלֵּא 2 Ch 24¹⁰, 31¹⁷, for which in 2 K 13^{17,19}, Ezr 9¹⁴ עַד-כִּפְלָה with infin. abs.; in Pu'al עָנֹת ψ 132¹.

11. The apocopated imperfect must (according to § 20 l) lose the *Dageš forte* *bb* of the second radical, hence וִיצָו and he commanded, תַּעַר (for תַּעֲרָה = t'arré) ψ 141⁸; cf. Gn 24²⁰; even in the principal pause אֶל-תִּנְלֵל Pr 25⁹; Hithpa'el וַיִּתְּנֵל and he uncovered himself, Gn 9²¹; תִּתְּרַע Pr 22²⁴; cf. ψ 37^{1,7,8}. With the lengthening of Pathah to Qames, וַיַּתֵּר and he made marks, 1 S 21¹⁴ (but read with Thenius וַיִּתְּרַק, and instead of the meaningless וַיִּשְׁנֹו *ibid.* read וַיִּשְׁנֹו). In Hithpa'el אֶל-תִּתְּרַק, in close connexion, Dt 2^{9,19}; תִּשְׁתַּע Is 41¹⁰; according to Qimhi also וַיִּתְּאוּ, תִּתְּאוּ ψ 45¹², Pr 23^{3,6}, 24¹, 1 Ch 11¹⁷, whilst Baer and Ginsburg read with the best authorities וַיִּתְּאוּ, תִּתְּאוּ (but cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. 597).¹—On אֶחָדֶךָ Jb 15¹⁷ (for אֶחָדֶךָ) cf. § 20 m; on אֶבְלָךָ Ex 33³, see § 27 q;

¹ In Nu 34⁷, according to verse 10, תִּתְּאוּ (= תִּתְּאוּ) is intended to be read for תִּתְּאוּ (imperfect Pi'el from תִּתְּאוּ).

on יָרַד Ju 5¹³, see § 69 g. Finally, on דָּלִי, which is referred to *Pi'el* by some, as a supposed *imperative*, see above, u.

cc 12. Examples of apocopated imperatives in *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* are: צִו, also צִוָּה command thou, פָּתַח open thou, ψ 110^{18,22}; מִן prepare thou, ψ 61⁸; נִסָּה prove thou, Dn 1¹²; הִתְחַלֵּף feign thyself sick, 2 S 13⁵; cf. Dt 2²⁴.—On רָבָה Ju 9²⁹, cf. § 48 l.—In ψ 137⁷ עָרַר raise it, is found twice instead of עָרַר (for 'arrû) for

dd 13. Examples of forms in which the *Yôdh* is retained are the *imperfects* תְּרַמְּיוּן Is 40¹⁸, cf. verse 25 and 46⁵; יִכְסִימוּ they cover them, Ex 15⁵; participle *Pu'al* מְאַרְיָה Is 25⁶; for אֲרִיָּה Is 16⁹ (from רָוָה) read with Margolis, אֲרִיָּה.

IV. On *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

ee 14. The 3rd sing. perfect *Hiph'il* sometimes has *S'ghôl* in the first syllable instead of *i* (§ 53 p), especially in הִנֵּלָה (but perfect consecutive וְהִנֵּלָה 2 K 24¹⁴), הִרְאָה, הִלְאָה; also with suffixes, e. g. הִנֵּלָם 1 Ch 87, הִלְאָנִי Jb 16⁷, וְהִפְדָּה Ex 21⁸. The *S'ghôl* also occurs in the 1st sing., e. g. הִלְאָתִי Mi 6³. On וְהִרְאִיתִי Na 3⁵, cf. § 53 p. The forms with *e* in the second syllable (also written defectively, as וְהִבְתִּי Jer 21⁶) are found throughout in the 1st sing. (except Pr 5¹³), rarely in the 2nd sing. masc., and never in the 1st plur. In the other persons they are about equally common with *i*, except in the 2nd plur., where *i* predominates. Before suffixes the forms with *i* predominate throughout; cf., however, *e* in Ex 4¹², Mi 6³, Pr 4¹¹. On the tone of the perf. consec. *Hiph.* of לָ"ה, see § 49 k. In *Hoph'al* only ' occurs in the 2nd syllable.

ff 15. In the infinitive *Hiph'il* of רָבָה to be abundant, besides the construct הִרְבוֹת we find the absolute הִרְבָּה taking the place of the common form הִרְבֵּה, which had come to be used invariably (but König calls attention to its use as infinitive construct in Ez 21²⁰) as an adverb, in the sense of *much*; in 2 S 14¹¹ the *Qerê* requires הִרְבֵּת for the *Kethibh* הִרְבִּית, an evident scribal error for הִרְבוֹת. Cf. Gn 41⁴⁹, 22¹⁷, Dt 28⁶³; the pointing הִרְבָּה Jer 42² probably arises from regarding this form as a noun.—On הִמְרוֹת Jb 17² (with *Dages f. dirimens*) see § 20 h.—In 2 K 3²⁴ הִבּוֹת (before א) is probably infinitive absolute, used in order to avoid the hiatus, cf. § 113 x, and on a similar case in *Qal*, see above, n.—On the infinitives with elision of the ה, cf. § 53 q.

gg 16. The shortened imperfect *Hiph'il* either takes no helping vowel, as יַפֵּת let him enlarge, Gn 9²⁷; יִרְדַּךְ he shall subdue, Is 41²; וַיִּשְׁק and he watered, Gn 29¹⁰, &c.; וַיִּרְא and he showed, 2 K 11⁴ (see § 28 d): or else has a helping vowel, as יִגְלַךְ (for יִגְלַךְ, see § 27 r), e. g. 2 K 18¹¹; וַיִּפְרַךְ ψ 105²⁴; וַיִּתְמַךְ Ez 5⁶; וַיִּתַּע 2 Ch 33⁹; i. e. probably וַיִּאָּרַב Jos 24³ *Kethibh* (וַיִּאָּרְבָה *Qerê*).—Examples of verbs first guttural: וַיַּעַל Nu 23², וַיִּזְעַל, &c., which can be distinguished as *Hiph'il* from the similar forms in *Qal* only by the sense.—The apocopated imperative *Hiph'il* always (except in verbs פָּ"ן, e. g. הָיָה, § 76 c) has a helping vowel, *S'ghôl* or *Pathah*, e. g. הִרְבֵּה increase thou (for *harb*, הִרְבָּה) ψ 51⁴ *Qerê*, also Ju 20³⁸; where, however, it cannot be explained the text stands; הִרְבֵּה let alone (for הִרְבָּה, הִרְבָּה Dt 9¹⁴, &c.; הִעָּלַךְ (for הִעָּלָה) Ex 8¹, 33¹²; but for הִשָּׁעַךְ ψ 39¹⁴, which could only be imperative *Hiph'il* of שָׁעַע (= smear over, as in Is 6¹⁰), read with Baethgen שָׁעָה look away.—The imperfect *Hiph'il* with *Yôdh* retained occurs only in תוֹרִיָּן Jb 19², from יָנָה. Cf. u.

V. In General.

17. In Aramaic the *imperfect* and *participle* of all the conjugations terminate *hh* in סְׁ or יְׁ . The Hebrew *infinitives*, *imperatives*, and *imperfects* in הְׁ , less frequently סְׁ or יְׁ , may be due to imitation of these forms. On the *infinitive construct* פִּי־עַל חֲבִי , see above, *aa*; *imperative Qal* הָיָא Jb 37⁶ (in the sense of *fall*); *imperfect* יִרָא let him look out, Gn 41³³ (but see above, *p*); יַעֲשֶׂה he will do, Is 64³; אֶל-תִּהְיֶה Jer 17¹⁷; אֶל-תִּבְכֵּא consent thou not, Pr 1¹⁰; אֶל-תַּעֲשֶׂה do thou not, 2 S 13¹² (the same form in Gn 26²⁹, Jos 7⁹, Jer 40¹⁶ *Q're*); אֶהְיֶה (so Baer and Ginsburg, after cod. Hillel, &c.) I will be, Jer 31¹; וְנַעֲשֶׂה Jos 9²⁴; הָרָאָה Dn 1¹³. Cf. also in *Niph'al* יִפְצֶה Lv 5⁹; תִּבְנֶה (according to Qimhi) Nu 21²⁷; in *Piel* תִּגְלֶה Lv 18^{7.8.12-17}, 20¹⁹, in each case לֹא תִגְלֶה , beside תִּגְלֶה with a minor distinctive; יִנְקָה (Baer יִנְקָה) Na 1³; אֶזְרָה Ez 5¹² (with *Zageph*; Baer אֶזְרָה). The fact, however, that a great number of these forms occur in *pause* and represent at the same time a *jussive* or *voluntative* (Jos 7⁹), suggests the view that the *Sere* is used merely to increase the emphasis of the pausal form, and at the same time to make a distinction in sound between the *jussive* or *voluntative* and the ordinary *imperfect*.¹ Elsewhere (Gn 26²⁹, Lv 5⁹, Jer 40¹⁶, Dn 1¹³; according to Baer also Mi 7¹⁰, Ze 9⁵) the pronunciation with *ê* is probably intended to soften the hiatus caused by a following מ or ע ; cf. the analogous cases above, § 74 *l*.

The ending יְׁ appears to stand for הְׁ in the *imperfect Qal* in וְתִינִי־שֵׁם *ii* and there hath she played the harlot, Jer 3⁶; perhaps, however, the 2nd *sing. fem.* is intended, or it may have been introduced into the text of Jeremiah from Ez 16¹⁵, &c. Still more strange is it in the *imperfect Hiph'il* אֶל-תִּתְּמֹחִי Jer 18²³; but the *Mil'el*-tone probably points to $\text{תִּמְחַ$ as the correct reading (cf. Neh 13¹⁴). The יְׁ stands for הְׁ in the *perfect Hiph'il* הִחֲלִי he made sick, Is 53¹⁰, which is probably for הִחֲלִי from חָלָא , a secondary form of חָלָה ; see *rr*. The *plur.* הִמְסִי (Baer הִמְסִי) they made to melt, Jos 14⁸, is a purely Aramaic form.

18. In two verbs the rare conjugation *Pa'lel* or its reflexive (§ 55 *d*) occurs: *kk* מִתְּחִי archers, Gn 21¹⁶ (from תַּחַה); but most frequently in שָׁחָה to bend, *Pa'lel* שָׁחָה not in use, whence reflexive הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה to bow oneself, to prostrate oneself, 2nd *pers.* in יָתִי and 1st *pers.* in יָתִי , *imperfect* יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה , consecutive 3rd *sing.* *masc.* וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה for *wayyistaw* (analogous to the noun-forms, like שָׁחַו for *sahw*); 3rd *plur.* יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶוּ .—Instead of the aramaizing *infinitive* with suffix $\text{בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתִי}$ 2 K 5¹⁸ read with König $\text{בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹתִי}$; in Ez 8¹⁶ מִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתִם is still more certainly a scribal error for מִשְׁתַּחֲוִים .

19. Before suffixes in all forms ending in הְׁ , a connecting vowel is employed *ll* instead of the הְׁ and the connecting vowel which precedes it (§ 58 *f*), e.g. נִחְנִי Gn 24²⁷; in *pause* עֲנִנִי I K 2³⁰, &c., even with lesser disjunctives, ψ 118⁵, Pr 8²², or with a conjunctive accent, I S 28¹⁵ (but Baer עֲנִנִי , Jb 30¹⁹; cf. § 59 *h*; עֲנֶה , in *pause* עֲנֶה , Is 30¹⁹ (and even when not in *pause* Jer 23³⁷) or like קִנְה Dt 32⁶; וַיִּפְרֶה , וַיִּרְבֶּה ; Gn 28³; cf. also עֲנָה , עָנָם , *imperfect* יַעֲנֶה , הִפְנִי , הִעֲלֶה , הִפְנִי .

Only very seldom does the *imperat.* or *impf.* end in יְׁ before suffixes, e.g. *mm*

¹ Possibly these examples (like the cases of *S'ghôl* in *pause*, see *n*) represent the view of a particular Masoretic school, which was intended to be consistently carried out.

אֶפְאַיֶהֶם Dt 32²⁶; וְיִכְפְּרִימוּ ψ 140¹⁰ *Qerê*; הִכְיִי smite me, 1 K 20^{35,37}; cf. Hb 3², Is 38¹⁶. Even in these examples a return to the original ending *ay* might be assumed; but perhaps they are merely due to a less correct *plene* writing. In the 3rd sing. perf. fem. the older form גָּלַת (see *i*) is always used before a suffix, e. g. בָּלְתָהוּ (בְּלַתְהוּ) Zc 5⁴; in pause עֲשֵׂתָנִי Jb 33⁴; רָאִתָּךְ 42⁵.

VI. The Relation between Verbs ל"ה and ל"א.

nn 20. The close relation existing between verbs ל"ה and ל"א is shown in Hebrew by the fact that the verbs of one class often borrow forms from the other, especially in the later writers and the poets.

OO 21. Thus there are forms of verbs ל"א—

(a) Which have adopted the vowels of verbs ל"ה, e. g. perfect Qal בָּלַאתִי I have refrained, ψ 119¹⁰¹; participle חוֹטֵא (חָטֵא) sinning, Ec 2²⁶, 8¹², 9^{2,18}; cf. Is 65²⁰; מוֹצֵא Ec 7²⁶; נוֹשֵׂא lending, 1 S 22²; Pi'el perfect מָלָא he has filled, Jer 51³⁴; cf. 1 K 9¹¹, Am 4² (where, however, the perfect Niph. is perhaps intended), ψ 89¹¹, 143³; רִפְּאתִי I heal, 2 K 22¹; cf. Jer 51⁹; imperfect יִנְפֹא Jb 39²⁴; Niph'al perfect נִפְלְאַתָּה (like נִנְלַתָּה) it was wonderful, 2 S 1²⁶; Hiph'il perfect הִפְלֵא Dt 28⁶⁰; הִחְבֵּאתָה (not אָתָּה—, cf. above, 2 S 1²⁶) she hid, Jos 6¹⁷. On the other hand, forms like חָטֵאִים 1 S 14³³, קָרֵאִים ψ 99⁶, נִרְפָּא Ez 47⁸, תִּרְבֹּאֵנִי, according to the correct reading, Jb 19² (cf. Gn 31³⁹ אֲחֻמֶּנָּה), and יִרְאוּ imperative plur. masc. from יָרָא Jos 24¹⁴, 1 S 12²⁴, ψ 34¹⁰, are due to the elision of the א, see § 74 *i*. On יִנְשֹׂא Jer 10⁶ and יִנְשֹׂא ψ 139²⁰, see § 23 *i*.

pp (b) Forms in ה, but keeping their ל"א vowels, e. g. imperfect Qal אֶרְפָּה Jer 3²²; imperative רַפֵּה רַפֵּה heal thou, ψ 60⁴; Niph'al נִחְבֶּה Jer 49¹⁰ (which must evidently be a perfect; read with Ewald the infinitive absolute נִחְבֶּה as in verse 23), and הִחְבֵּה to hide oneself, 1 K 22²⁵, cf. Jer 19¹¹; Pi'el imperfect יִמְלֵה he will fill, Jb 8²¹.

qq (c) Forms entirely of ל"ה character, e. g. perfect Qal וְצָמַת and when thou art athirst, Ru 2⁹, cf. 2 S 3⁸; בָּלוּ they shut up, 1 S 6¹⁰; cf. 25³³; מָלוּ they are full, Ez 28¹⁶, cf. 39²⁶; infinitive חָטוּ (see above, *n*) to sin, Gn 20⁶ (on מָלֵאת see above, § 74 *h*); imperative sing. fem. חֲבִי Is 26²⁰; imperfect יִכְלֶה (for יִכְלֵא) he will keep back, Gn 23⁶; תִּרְפִּינָה they heal, Jb 5¹⁸; participle בּוֹטֶה Pr 12¹⁸; fem. אָצָא Ec 10⁵; plur. צָבִיָּה Is 29⁷; participle passive נִשְׁוִי ψ 32¹; Niph'al נִרְפָּתָה Jer 51⁹; נִבִּיתָ thou hast prophesied, Jer 26⁹ (cf. ψ 139¹⁴, Jb 18³); imperfect יִנְרִפוּ 2 K 2²² (infinitive Jer 19¹¹); Pi'el imperfect יִרְפוּ Jer 8¹¹, cf. Gn 31³⁹; Hiph'il participle מִקְנֶה Ez 8³; Hithpa'el הִתְנַבִּיתָ 1 S 10⁶; infinitive הִתְנַבּוּת 1 S 10¹³. For the *Kethibh* להִשְׁאוֹת (so Is 37²⁶); 2 K 19²⁵, Jablonski and others require as *Qerê* the form לְהִשְׁאוֹת (so Is 37²⁶); the *Kethibh* would have to be read לְהִשְׁאוֹת, with elision of the א and retraction of the vowel.

rr 22. On the other hand, there are forms of verbs ל"ה, which wholly or in part follow the analogy of verbs ל"א, e. g. in their consonants אָתָּא he comes, Is 21¹²; בָּרָא 2 S 12¹⁷ (*textus receptus* בָּרָה); וִרְצָאתִי Ez 43²⁷; יִשְׁנָא Jb 8¹¹; יִשְׁנָא La 4¹; וִיחַלָּא 2 Ch 16¹²; חִקְרָאנָה Ex 1¹⁰, Lv 10¹⁹; תִּלְאִים Dt 28⁶⁶ (cf. Ho 11⁷); נִקְרָא (*infin. absol.* Niph'al beside נִקְרִיתִי) 2 S 1⁶; שָׁנָא 2 K 25²⁹; מִרְפָּא

Jer 38⁴; יִשְׁנָא Ec 8¹: in their vowels, אָתְנַנְי Jer 3²²; יִקְרָה Dn 10¹⁴; תִּכְלָה 1 K 17¹⁴: in both, יִקְרָה Gn 49¹; cf. 42⁴, Is 51¹⁹; הִלְלָאִים 2 S 21¹² *Q^{eré}*; לִירוּא 2 Ch 26¹⁵ (cf. וִירָאוּ הַמִּזְרָאִים 2 S 11²⁴ *K^{ethibh}*); כִּרְרָא (participle fem. Qal) Zp 3¹; יִפְרִיא Ho 13¹⁵; מִסְלָאִים La 4².—For פִּרְאוֹת (so Baer, Ez 17⁶, cf. 31⁸), which can only be intended for פִּרְאוֹת participle fem. plur. from פָּרָא = פָּרַה, read פִּרְאוֹת branches, according to Ez 31⁵, &c.

§ 76. Verbs Doubly Weak.

1. In a tolerably large number of verbs two radicals are weak *a* letters, and are consequently affected by one or other of the anomalies already described. In cases where two anomalies might occur, usage must teach whether one, or both, or neither of them, takes effect.

Thus e.g. from נָדַר to flee, the imperfect is יִדֹּר in Na 3⁷ and יִדֹּר in Gn 31⁴⁰ (on the analogy of verbs פ"ן); Hiph'il הִנְדֵּר (like a verb ע"ע), but the imperfect Hoph'al again יִדֹּר (as פ"ן).

2. The following are examples of difficult forms, which are derived *b* from doubly weak verbs:

(a) Verbs פ"ן and ל"ה (cf. § 66 and § 74), e.g. נָשָׂא to bear, imperative נִשָּׂא (ψ 10¹² נִשָּׂא, of which נָסָה ψ 4⁷ is probably only an orthographic variation); infinitive construct שָׂאת (for שִׂאת; see the analogous noun-formations in § 93 t), also נִשָּׂא Is 1¹⁴, 18³; Gn 4¹³ נִשָּׂא; ψ 89¹⁰ שֹׂא (perhaps only a scribal error); after the prefix ל always לִשָּׂאת (otherwise the contracted form only occurs in מִשָּׂחוּ Jb 41¹⁷, with rejection of the א); imperfect תִּשָּׂנֶה for תִּשָּׂאָנָה Ru 1¹⁴; wholly irregular are תִּשָּׂאֲנִיָּה Ez 23⁴⁹ (so Baer after Qimhi; *textus receptus*, and also the Mantua ed., and Ginsburg, תִּשָּׂאֲנִיָּה) and נִשָּׂאת 2 S 19⁴³ as infinitive absolute Niph'al (on the analogy of the infinitive construct Qal?); but most probably נִשָּׂא is to be read, with Driver.

(b) Verbs פ"ן and ל"ה (cf. § 66 and § 75), as נָטָה to bow, to incline, נָכָה to C smite. Hence imperfect Qal יִטָּה, apocopated וַיִּט (Gn 26²⁵ וַיִּט) and he bowed; וַיִּז (so, probably, also Is 63³ for וַיִּז) 2 K 9³³ and he sprinkled (from נָזָה); perfect Hiph'il הִכָּה he smote, imperfect יִכָּה, apocopated יָיָה, יָיָה (even with Athnah 2 K 15¹⁶; but also ten times וַיִּכָּה, וַיִּכָּה Dt 2³³; so also וַיִּז Lv 8^{11,30}; ψ 141⁴ (cf. Jb 23¹¹); imperative הִכָּה, apocopated הָה smite thou (like הִטָּה, with הִטָּה), infinitive הִכּוֹת, participle מִכָּה; Hoph'al הִכָּה, participle מִכָּה.

(c) Verbs פ"א and ל"ה (cf. § 68 and § 75), as אָכָה to be willing, אָפָה to bake, אָתָה to come. E.g. imperfect Qal יִאָּכָה, יִאָּפָה, plur. יִאָּפּוּ; יִאָּתָה (cf. § 68 h) Dt 33²¹ for וַיִּאָּתָה (= וַיִּאָּתָה); imperfect apocopated וַיִּאָּת Is 41²⁵ for וַיִּאָּת; imperative אָתְיָה Is 21¹², 56^{9,12} (cf. אָפּוּ bake ye, Ex 16²³) for אָתְיָה, אָתְיָה (§ 23 h; § 75 u); Hiph'il perfect הִתְיָה הִתְיָהוּ הִתְיָהוּ Is 21¹⁴; imperfect apocopated וַיִּתְיָה and he adjured, 1 S 14²⁴, properly יִתְיָה (יִתְיָה) from אָלָה, whence יִתְיָה, and, with the obscuring to *ô*, יִתְיָה; instead of the simple *apocope* (יִתְיָה) the א which had already become

quiescent, is made audible again by the helping *S^{egh}ôl* (unless perhaps there is a confusion with the *imperfect consecutive Hiph'il* of יֵאָחַל).

e (d) Verbs פָּ"ו and לָ"ה (cf. § 69, § 70, and § 74), as יֵצֵא to go forth, imperative יֵצֵא go forth, with הָ—paragogic יֵצֵאָה Ju 9²⁹ in principal pause for יֵצֵאָה; 2nd fem. plur. יֵצֵאָנָה Ct 3¹¹; infinitive יֵצֵאת Hiph'il הוֹצִיא to bring forth.—יִירָא to fear, imperfect יִירָא and יִירָא (or יִירָא), imperative יִירָא; imperfect Niph'al יִירָאָה ψ 130⁴, participle יִירָאָה.

f (e) Verbs פָּ"ו and לָ"ה (cf. § 69, § 70, and § 75), e.g. יִרְה to throw, Hiph'il to confess, to praise, and יִרְה to throw (both properly verbs פָּ"ו), and יִפְה to be beautiful. Infinitive יִרְה, יִרְהוֹת; imperative יִרְה; imperfect consecutive יִרְהוּ Ez 31⁷ (cf. also וְהִיפִי 16¹³); with suffixes וְנִירְהוּ we have shot at them (from יִרְה) Nu 21³⁰; perhaps, however, it should be read with the LXX וְנִירְהוּ and their race (also in the very corrupt passage ψ 74⁸ is probably a substantive, and not the imperfect Qal with suffix from יִרְה); Pi'el יִירְהוּ for יִירְהוּ (§ 69 u). Hiph'il הוֹרְה, הוֹרְה; infinitive הוֹרְה (as infinitive absolute 2 Ch 7³); imperfect יוֹרְה, cf. אֶל־הֵנָּה Jer 22³; apocopated יוֹרְה 2 K 13¹⁷.

g (f) Verbs עָ"ו and לָ"ה, particularly בֹּא to come. Perfect בָּאָה, בָּאָה, בָּאָה or בָּאָה (Gn 16⁸, 2 S 14³, Mi 4¹⁰; cf. § 75 m), once בָּאָה for בָּאָה 1 S 25⁸; for בָּאָה Jer 27¹⁸, which is apparently the perfect, read יִבָּאָה. In the imperfect Qal the separating vowel occurs (תִּבְאָהָ instead of the more common תִּבְאָהָ, cf. also תִּבְאָהָ Gn 30³⁸) only in Jer 9¹⁶, ψ 45¹⁶, and 1 S 10⁷ K^{ethibh}.

h For וּתְבָאָה 1 S 25³⁴ Q^{ere} (the K^{ethibh} וּתְבָאָה evidently combines the two readings וּתְבָאָה and וּתְבָאָה; cf. Nestle, ZAW. xiv. 319), read וּתְבָאָה; on the impossible forms Dt 33¹⁶ and Jb 22²¹ cf. § 48 d.—In the perfect Hiph'il הִבִּיאָה, הִבִּיאָה and (only before a suffix) הִבִּיאָה; the latter form is also certainly intended in Nu 14³¹, where the Masora requires וְהִבִּיאָה, cf. 2 K 9², 19²⁵, Is 43²³, Jer 25¹³, Ct 3⁴. Before suffixes the *e* of the first syllable in the 3rd sing. always becomes H^{ateph}-S^{egh}ôl, e.g. הִבִּיאָה, הִבִּיאָה; elsewhere invariably H^{ateph}-P^{athah}, e.g. הִבִּיאָה or הִבִּיאָה. On the other hand, *e* is retained in the secondary tone in the perfect consecutive when without suffixes, e.g. וְהִבִּיאָה. Cf. moreover, וְהִקְאָהוּ (וְהִקְאָהוּ in Opius and Hahn is altogether incorrect), Pr 25¹⁶, from קִיא; but וְהִקְאָהוּ, Jer 25²⁷ (perhaps only a mistake for וְהִקְאָהוּ), is not to be referred to קִיא but to a secondary stem קִיה. In the imperfect וְהִקְאָה is found once, Lv 18²⁵, besides וְהִקְאָה (analogous to וְהִקְאָה).—On אָבִי (for אָבִי, מְבִי, יִנִּי, see § 74 k).

i (g) The form חִי to live, in the perfect Qal, besides the ordinary development to חִיָּה (fem. חִיָּה), is also treated as a verb עָ"ו, and then becomes חִי in the 3rd pers. perfect, in pause חִי, and with wāw consecutive וְחִי Gn 3²², and frequently. In Lv 25³⁶ the contracted form חִי is perhaps st. constr. of חִי life, but in any case read וְחִי perfect consecutive as in verse 35. The form וְחִיָּה occurs in Ex 1¹⁶ in pause for וְחִיָּה (3rd fem.) with Dageš omitted in the י on account of the pausal lengthening of *ä* to *ā*.

§ 77. *Relation of the Weak Verbs to one another.*

The close relation which exists between some classes of the weak *a* verbs (e.g. between פ"ו and פ"י, ל"א and ל"ה, ע"ע and ע"י, ע"ע and ע"ה) appears not only in their similarity or identity of inflexion, or their mutual interchange of certain forms, but especially from the fact that frequently the same root (*radix bilittera*, see § 30 g) recurs in various weak stems of similar meaning. The meaning accordingly is inherent in the two constant root-consonants, while the third consonant, which is weak (and the particular class of weak verbs with it), does not establish any difference in the meaning. Thus from the root דָּךְ there occur with the same meaning דָּכַךְ, דִּיךְ, דָּכָא to *strike, to crush*; and from the root נָד there are נִיד, נָדַד, נָדָה to *flee*.

In this manner the following classes are related in form and *b* meaning:

1. Verbs ע"י and ע"ע in which the first and third consonants are the same in both, as being essential to the meaning; e.g. מוּךְ and מָכַךְ to *become poor*; מוּשׁ and מָשַׁשׁ to *feel*; נִיד and נָדַד to *flee*.

2. Verbs פ"י and פ"ן; e.g. יָצַב and נָצַב to *place*, יָקַשׁ and נָקַשׁ (*yāqōš*) to *lay snares*. Moreover, stems belonging to the classes mentioned in 1 (especially ע"י) are frequently related also to verbs פ"י and פ"ן, e.g. יָוַר and יָנַר to *fear*; יָטַב and פָּטַח to *be good*; פָּוַח and פָּוַח to *blow*; נָפַץ and פָּוַץ to *dash to pieces*. Verbs פ"א are less frequently connected with these classes, e.g. אָרַשׁ and דָּוַשׁ to *thresh, &c.*

3. Verbs ל"ה and ל"ה (in which the first two consonants form the real *d* body of the stem) are sometimes related to each other, and sometimes to the above classes. To each other, in דָּכָא and דָּכָה to *crush*, קָרָא and קָרָה to *meet* (cf. § 75 *nn*); to verbs of the other classes, in מָצָא and מָצִיעַ to *suck*, דָּחָה and דָּוַח to *thrust, &c.*

4. Verbs ע"ה and ע"ה, on which cf. Grimm, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1903, p. 196; e.g. אָנָה and אָנַן to *sigh*, דָּמָה and דָּמַם to *be quiet*, חָנָה and חָנַן to *incline*, בָּלָה and בָּלָה to *end*, קָלָה and קָלַל to *despise*, שָׁנָה and שָׁנַג to *err*, שָׁחָה and שָׁחַח to *bend down*, שָׁסָה and שָׁסַם to *plunder*.

5. Verbs ע"י and ע"ה; e.g. מוּל and מוּל (New Hebrew; in O. T. only מוּל *f* Is 1²²) to *circumcise*, מוּר and מוּרָה to *exchange*, נוּר (in מְנוּרָה a *light*) and נוּרָה to *shine*; cf. also לְהַטִּים *secret arts*, Ex 7¹¹ with לָט *secret*, from לוּט.

§ 78. *Verba Defectiva.*

It often happens, when two kindred weak verbs are in use with *a* the same meaning, that both are *defective*, i. e. do not occur in all the forms. Since, however, those tenses and forms which are not in use in the one verb are generally supplied by the other, they mutually complete one another, and thus form together, as it were, an entire

verb, as in Greek *ἐρχομαι*, aor. *ἦλθον*, fut. *ἐλεύσομαι*, and in Latin *fero*, *tuli*, *latum*, *ferre*, &c., but with this difference, that in Hebrew the roots of these verbs are almost always closely related.

b The most common verbs of this kind are—

בשׁ to be ashamed. *Hiph'il* הִבִּישׁ (inferred from הִבְשִׁית), but also הִבִּישׁ, as if from יִבֵּשׁ, on the analogy of verbs פִּ"י; also in Is 30⁵ the *Qere* requires הִבִּישׁ, where the *Kethibh* has הִבְשִׁישׁ from בָּאֵשׁ.

טב to be good. Perfect טוב; but imperfect יִטֵּב and *Hiph'il* הִיטִיב from טָב (but cf. הִטִּיבָה 2 K 10³⁰).

יזר to be afraid. Imperfect יִזְר (from יָזַר).

יקן to awake, only in the imperf. יִקֵּן; for the perfect, the *Hiph'il* הִקִּיץ is used (from קִיץ).

נפץ to break in pieces. Imperfect יִפֹּץ (from פָּצַח). Imperative פֹּץ. *Niph'al* נִפְצָח. *Piel* נִפֵּץ (from נָפַץ). *Pötel* פּוֹצֵץ (from פָּצַח). Reflexive הִתְפּוֹצֵץ. *Hiph'il* הִפְצִיחַ. Also פִּצְצִיחַ Jb 16¹².

נצב (*Qal* in post-biblical Hebrew, in Aramaic and Arabic) to place, whence (possibly) *Niph'al* נִצְבַּ and *Hiph'il* הִצִּיב (see above, § 71); but *Hithpa'el* הִתְנַצַּב.

שָׁתה to drink, used in *Qal*; but in *Hiph.* הִשְׁקָה to give to drink, from a *Qal* שָׁקָה which is not used in Hebrew.

On הָלַךְ (יָלַךְ) to go, see above, § 69 x.

c Rem. 1. To the same category belong also, to a certain extent, those cases where the tenses or moods not in use in one conjugation, are supplied by forms having the same meaning in other conjugations of the same verb. Thus:

יָסַף to add. The infinitive (but cf. § 69 h, note) and imperfect, unused in *Qal*, are supplied by the *Hiph'il* הוֹסִיף, יוֹסִיף (on יוֹסִיף as imperfect indicative, see § 109 d, cf. also § 109 i).

כָּשַׁל to stumble. Perfect from *Qal*, imperfect from *Niph'al*.

נָגַשׁ to approach, unused in perf. *Qal*, instead of which *Niph'al* נִגַּשׁ is used; but imperfect יִגַּשׁ, imperative נִגַּשׁ, and infinitive נִגֵּשׁ from *Qal* only are in use.

נָחָה to lead. Perfect usually נָחָה in *Qal*, so imperative נִחָה, but imperfect and infinitive always in *Hiph'il*.

נָתַךְ to be poured out. Perfect *Niph'al* נִתְּךְ with imperfect *Qal* יִתְּךְ, but the perfect *Qal* and imperfect *Niph'al* are not in use.

2. The early grammarians often speak of mixed forms (*formae mixtae*), i.e. forms which unite the supposed character and meaning of two different tenses, genders, or conjugations. Most of the examples adduced are at once set aside by accurate grammatical analysis; some others appear to have arisen from misapprehension and inaccuracy, especially from erroneous views of unusual *plene* forms. Others, again, are either merely wrong readings or represent an intentional conflation of two different readings.

CHAPTER III

THE NOUN

§ 79. General View.

For the literature, see De Lagarde, *Uebersicht über die im Aram., Arab. und Hebr. übliche Bildung der Nomina*, Göttingen, 1889; Index and Additions, 1891; J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, first half, *Simple nouns*, Leipzig, 1889; second half, *Nouns with external additions*, 1891; second edition, with indices of words and subjects, 1894; E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude*, &c., ii. 1, Leipzig, 1895, see above, § 3 f.—Of these three important works the first two especially have given rise to various articles. In support of De Lagarde: Hommel in *ZDMG.* xlv, p. 535 ff. (against De Lagarde and Hommel: Barth, *ibid.*, p. 679 ff.), and dealing with the Index, *ZDMG.* xlv, p. 340 ff.—Against Barth (though with many points of agreement): Philippi in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, 1890, p. 344 ff. (answered by Barth in *ZDMG.* xlv, p. 692 ff.), and *ZDMG.* xlvi, p. 149 ff. (answered again by Barth, *ibid.*, xlviii, p. 10 ff.), also in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii (1892), p. 359 ff. 'Die semitische Verbal- und Nominalbildung,' and lastly, in *ZDMG.* xlix, p. 187 ff.—Cf. also A. Müller, 'Semitische Nomina. Bemerkungen zu de Lagarde und Barth,' *ZDMG.* xlv, p. 221 ff.—The main points at issue in the works of De Lagarde and Barth are indicated below, § 83 d.—Brockelmann, *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 104 ff.; *Grundriss*, p. 329 ff.

1. Since, according to § 30 a, most word-stems are developed into a verbal stems as well as into noun-stems, it has become customary (especially in the Lexicon) to refer the noun to the most simple ground-form of the verbal formation, viz. the 3rd pers. sing. perfect *Qal*, and, as it were, to derive it from that form. This is usual, not only in those noun-stems which can be directly connected with a corresponding verbal stem (*Nomina verbalia* or *derivativa*, § 83 ff.), but also with *Nomina primitiva*, i. e. those of which no verbal stem is now found in Hebrew (see § 82), as well as finally with *Nomina denominativa*, which have evidently been derived from other nouns (§ 86).

The adjective agrees in form entirely with the substantive. On the formation of adjectival ideas by giving to abstracts a concrete sense, see § 83 c.

2. A special inflexion of the noun to express the various cases does *b* not exist in Hebrew; only a few ancient and almost extinct traces of case-endings have survived (§ 90). The syntactical relation of a noun can therefore in general only be inferred from its position in the sentence, or from its being joined to prepositions. In either case, the form of the noun undergoes no change (except for the *construct*

state, § 89), and the representation of case-relations belongs therefore almost exclusively to the syntax (§ 117 ff.). The comparative and superlative of adjectives also can be expressed only by a syntactical combination (§ 133). On the other hand, several changes in the forms of nouns are occasioned by the additions of the plural, dual, and feminine terminations, as well as of the pronominal suffixes, and also by the close connexion of two nouns, by means of the *construct state*.¹

§ 80. The Indication of Gender in Nouns.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 404 ff.; 'Ueber die Femininendung *at, ah, ā*' in *Semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 106 f.; *Grundriss*, pp. 105, 405 ff.; 'Die Femininendung *T im Semit.*' (*Sitzung d. orient.-sprachwiss. Sektion d. schlesischen Gesellschaft*, Feb. 26, 1903); against him J. Barth, *ZDMG.* 1903, p. 628 ff.; Brockelmann's reply, *ibid.*, p. 795 ff.; and Barth again, *ibid.*, p. 798 ff.

a 1. The Hebrew, like all Semitic languages, recognizes only two genders in the noun, a *masculine* and a *feminine*. Inanimate objects and abstract ideas, which other languages sometimes indicate by the *neuter*, are regarded in Hebrew either as masculine or feminine, more often the latter (see the Syntax, § 122 q).

b 2. The *masculine*, as being the more common and important gender, has no special indication.

Feminine nouns are also without an indication of gender when the meaning of the word naturally denotes a feminine, as אִמָּה *mother*, אֶתֶן *a she-ass*, יֵשָׁר *a she-goat*, אֶתֶן *an ewe* (cf. § 122 b). As a rule, however, the *feminine* had originally the ending ת־, as in the 3rd *sing. perfect* of verbs (§ 44 a). This ת־, however, is regularly retained in Hebrew only in close connexion with a following genitive or suffix (cf. § 89 e and § 91 o), except where the form has arisen through the addition of a simple ת² (see below, d). Otherwise, the feminine ending of the independent form (the *absolute state*, § 89 a) is—

c (a) Most commonly a tone-bearing ת־, e.g. סוּס *equus*, סוּסָה *equa*. Of nouns ending in י־, like עֶבְרִי, the feminine (by § 24 b) is עֶבְרִיָה, cf. § 86 h. As in the 3rd *sing. fem. perfect* (קָטְלָה, &c.), this ת־ seems to have arisen by the rejection of the final ת, and the lengthening of the *ā* in the open syllable, whereupon the ה was added as an orthographic indication of the final long vowel: cf. the exactly similar origin of such forms as גִּלָּה for גִּלִּי, § 75 c. It must, however, be

¹ To speak of these changes as a declension of the Hebrew noun, as is usually done, is accordingly incorrect.

² In Mal 1¹⁴ מִשְׁחָת (so e.g. ed. Mant.) would stand for מִשְׁחָתָהּ, the ptep. fem. Hoph'al; but מִשְׁחָת (so Baer and Ginsb.) is also supported by good authority.

noticed that in Arabic (see *m* and note) the pausal form of *at* is *ah*, of which a trace may be preserved in the Hebrew הַ .

(b) Simple ת with nouns ending in a vowel, e.g. יְהוּדִי *Jew*, יְהוּדִית *d Jewess*. The same ending ת is very frequently added to stems ending in a consonant, but only (except before suffixes) by means of a helping vowel, which, as a rule, is *Seghôl*, but after gutturals *Pathah*, e.g. קָטַל , *fem.* קָטַלְתְּ , *killing*; before suffixes, e.g. קָטַלְתִּי , according to the rule given in § 69 c, cf. also § 84^a s; מוֹדַע *an acquaintance*, *fem.* מוֹדַעַת . The forms which arise in this way follow in every respect the analogy of the *segholate* forms (§ 94 f). The forms which have been developed by means of a helping vowel are retained even in the connective form (*construct state*); except וְיָלְדָתְּ (for וְיָלְדָתְּ , which is used elsewhere) Gn 16¹¹, Ju 13^{5.7}; cf. Jer 22²³ and 51¹³ *Qerê*, also מְשַׁרְת 1 K 1¹⁵, *participle fem.* *Pî'el*, properly *mê'sāratt*= מְשַׁרְתָּח ; also מְבַעֲרָה (*participle fem.* *Pî'el* with suffix) arises from the form מְבַעֲרָת which was developed into מְבַעֲרָת .

Rem. 1. The fem. form in תְּ is in general less frequent, and occurs *e* almost exclusively when the form in $\text{תַּ$ is also in use. It is only in the participles and infinitives that it is the commoner, e.g. קָטַלְתְּ more common than לָדָת , לָדָת than $\text{לָדָה$.

2. Rarer feminine endings are—(a) תְּ with the tone, e.g. בִּרְבָּת *emerald*, *f* Ez 28¹³ (also בִּרְבָּת Ex 28¹⁷); שְׂפָעַת *a company*, 2 K 9¹⁷, unless the reading is wrong; more frequently in proper names, especially of places among the Canaanites or Phoenicians (in whose language תְּ was the usual fem. ending, § 2 d) and other neighbouring tribes,¹ e.g. זִרְפָּת *Zarephath*, גִּבְעָת *Gibeath*, קִרְיָת *Kiriath*, אֵילָת *Greek Ailana* in Idumea; אֶחָת Gn 26²⁶: on the reading גִּלְיָת cf. g. Cf., moreover, נְגִינָת ψ 61¹ (prob. originally *נְגִינָת*; חִית (LXX חִיּוֹת) 74^{13a}; פּוֹנָת La 2¹⁸; [רַבָּת] *much*, in ψ 65¹⁰, 120⁶, 123⁴, 129^{1.2}, is a form borrowed from the Aramaic (Syriac *rabbath*) in which the original *t* of the fem. is often retained to form adverbs, see Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 135.]

(b) $\text{תַּ$, which likewise occurs in some names of places, e.g. חֶלְקָת , בְּעֶלְת , *g* as well as in the masc. proper name גִּלְיָת 1 S 17⁴, &c. (in 17²³, and 21¹⁰, ed. Mant. has גִּלְיָת), and in the fem. proper name שְׂמֻעָת ; otherwise, almost only in poetry, viz. זִמְרָת Ex 15², Is 12², ψ 118¹⁴ (really for זִמְרָתִי *my song*; the absorption of the *i*, however, can scarcely have 'taken place in the Aramaic manner', as suggested by Duhm on Is 12², nor is it due merely to the following *Yôdh*, but is intended 'to facilitate the absorption of *y*'; so Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 277 f.); נַחֲלָת *heritage*, ψ 16⁶ (either again for נַחֲלָתִי *my heritage*, or for נַחֲלָתָה , cf. § 90 g, as probably also עֲזָרָת *help*, ψ 60¹³, 108¹³ for עֲזָרָתָה). These forms are possibly

¹ In the list of Palestinian towns taken by Pharaoh Shoshenq, the feminine town-names all end in *t*. Cf. also the Mēša' inscription, line 3, הַבְּמַת זֹאת *this high place*; line 26, הַמַּסְלָת *the highway* [see also Driver, *Tenses*, § 181, note].

survivals from a period when even final vowels were not supported by a vowel-letter. Cf. also פֶּרֶת *fecunda* (a fruitful tree) Gn 49²²; יְתֵרָה *abundance*, Jer 48³⁶ (before ע; but in Is 15⁷ יְתֵרָה נִשְׁנָה *sleep* (for נִשְׁנָה) ψ 132⁴; and (unless the ת is radical) in prose קָצַת *pelican* (which reading is also preferable, in Is 34¹¹, to the form קָצַת), also מָחָרָה *the morrow*, but in *construct state* always מִמָּחָרָה. Jer 45²⁵ Q^{eré} is no doubt intended to indicate the reading תְּהִלָּתִי, parallel to מְשׁוּשִׁי; cf. above, on וְמִדָּת, &c.

h (c) אָ, the Aramaic orthography for הָ, chiefly in the later writers; נָא *loathing*, Nu 11²⁰; חָאָ *a terror*, Is 19¹⁷; נִשְׁנָא *sleep*, ψ 127²; לְבִיָּא *a lioness*, Ez 19² (unless לְבִיָּא is intended); מִטָּרָא *a mark*, La 3¹²; cf. also דִּשְׁאָ *threshing* (participle Qal from דָּשָׁ) Jer 50¹¹; מָרָא *bitter*, Ru 1²⁰. On the other hand, according to the western Masora, קָרְחָה *baldness* is to be read in Ez 27⁵¹; see Baer on the passage.

i (d) הָ, an obtuse form of הָ (§ 27 u), only in הַוִּירָה for הַוִּירָה Is 59⁵ (unless it is again a *forma mixta* combining the active *ptcp. masc.* הַוִּירָה and the passive *ptcp. fem.* הַוִּירָה); cf. לָנָה for לָנָה Zc 5⁴; אָנָה 1 K 2^{36.42} (§ 90 i, and § 48 d).

k (e) הָ, without the tone, e.g. רָחֶמָה Dt 14¹⁷ [Lv 11¹⁸ רָחֶם]; תִּנּוּרָה *an oven heated*, Ho 7⁴; cf. Ez. 40¹⁹, 2 K 15²⁹, 16¹⁸. In all these examples the usual tone-bearing הָ is perhaps intended, but the Punctuators, who considered the feminine ending inappropriate, produced a kind of *locative* form (see § 90 c) by the retraction of the tone. [In 2 K 16¹⁸, Is 24¹⁹, Ez 21³¹ (note in each case the following הָ), and in Jb 42¹³, Ho 7⁴, the text is probably in error.]

l (f) הָ, as an old feminine termination, preserved also in Syriac (*ai*; see examples in Nöldeke's *Syrische Gram.*, § 83), in Arabic and (contracted to *ê*) in Ethiopic, very probably occurs in the proper name שָׂרַי *Sarai*, cf. Nöldeke, ZDMG. xl. 183, and xlii. 484; also עֶשְׂרֵה *ten (fem.)* undoubtedly arises from an original 'esray; so Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 138; König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 427.

m 3. It is wholly incorrect to regard the vowel-ending הָ² as the original termination of the feminine, and the consonantal ending תָ as derived from it. The Ethiopic still has the ת throughout, so too the Assyrian (*at, it*); in Phœnician also the feminines end for the most part in ת, which is pronounced *at* in the words found in Greek and Latin authors; less frequently in מ (see Gesenius, *Monum. Phœn.*, pp. 439, 440; Schröder, *Phœn. Sprache*, p. 169 ff.). The ancient Arabic has the obtuse ending (*ah*) almost exclusively in *pause*; in modern Arabic the relation between the two endings is very much as in Hebrew.

¹ In 1 S 2c²⁷ also, where the Masora (see Baer on Jos 5¹¹) for some unknown reason requires מִמָּחָרָה, read with ed. Mant., Jablonski, Opatius, and Ginsburg, מִמָּחָרָה.

² In this ending the ה h can only be considered consonantal in the sense that the ת was originally aspirated, and afterwards 'the mute ת was dropped before h, just as the old Persian *mīthra* became in modern Persian *mīhr*'; so Socin, who also points to the Arabic pausal form in *ah*, and observes that among some of the modern Beduin an h is still heard as a fem. ending, cf. Socin, *Divan aus Centralarabien*, iii. 98, ed. by H. Stumme, Lpz. 1901. In Hebrew this consonantal termination was entirely abandoned, at any rate in later times.

§ 81. Derivation of Nouns.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 329 ff.

Nouns are by their derivation either *primitive*, i. e. cannot be *a* referred to any verbal stem at present extant (see § 82), such as אב *father*, אם *mother* (but see both words in the Lexicon; according to Stade and others אב, אם, &c., are children's words and terms of endearment, and so really primitive nouns), or *derivative*, i. e. either *Derivativa verbalia* (§§ 83-5), e. g. רם *high*, רמה *high place*, מרומ *height*, from רום *to be high*, or less frequently *Derivativa denominativa* (§ 86), e. g. מרגלות *the place at the feet*, from רגל *foot*.

Rem. 1. The earlier grammarians consider the verb alone as stem, and therefore *all* nouns as verbals, dividing them into (a) *Formae nudaæ*, i. e. such as have only the *three* (or *two*) radicals, and (b) *Formae auctæ*, such as have formative letters or syllables added at the beginning or end, e. g. מלכה, מלכות. The formative letters used for this purpose are ה א ט נ ת י ו (האמנתי),¹ and the treatment of nouns formerly followed this order.

According to the view of *roots* and *stems* presented in § 30 d, nouns (other *C* than *denominatives*) are derived not from the verbal stem, but either from the (abstract) root or from the still undefined stem. In the following pages, however, the arrangement according to the verbal stem is retained as being simpler for the beginner. Cf. § 79 a.

2. Compound nouns as *appellatives* are very rare in Hebrew, e. g. בליעל *d* *worthlessness, baseness*. On the other hand, they very frequently occur as proper names, e. g. גבריאל (*man of God*), יהוֹיָקִים (*Yahwe raises up*), יהוֹנָתָן (*Yahwe gave*), &c.²

§ 82. Primitive Nouns.

The number of *primitive* nouns in the sense used in § 81 is small, since nouns, which in other languages are represented as independent noun-stems, can easily be traced back in Hebrew to the verbal idea, e. g. names of animals and natural objects, as שְׁעִיר *he-goat* (prop. *shaggy*, from שָׁעַר), שְׁעָרָה *barley* (prop. *prickly*, also from שָׁעַר), חֲסִידָה *stork* (prop. *pia*, sc. *avis*), זָהָב *gold* (from זָהַב = צָהַב *to shine, to be yellow*). Thus there remain only a few nouns, e. g. several names of members of the body in men or beasts, to which a corresponding verbal stem cannot be assigned at all, or at any rate only indirectly (from other Semitic dialects), as קֶרֶן *horn*, עַיִן *eye*.

¹ From this *vox memorialis* the *nomina aucta* are also called by the older grammarians *nomina heemantica*.

² G. Rammelt (*Über die zusammengesetzten Nomina im Hebr.*, Halle, 1883, and Leipzig, 1884) recognizes as appellatives only צְפֹרֶדֶעַ (cf. below, § 85 w) and צִלְמוֹת (the latter certainly incorrectly [see, however, Nöldeke, *ZATW.* 1897, p. 183 ff.]). In p. 8 ff. the author gives a list of 'logical compounds', i. e. new terms formed by composition with the negatives לֹא, בְּלִי, מְבִלִי.

§ 83. Verbal Nouns in General.

- a* 1. In Hebrew, as in Greek and Latin, the *verbal nouns* are connected in form and meaning primarily with certain forms of the verb, especially the participles and infinitives, which are themselves, even in their ordinary form, frequently used precisely like nouns, e. g. *אֹיֵב* *enemy*, *דָּעַת* *to know, knowledge*. Still oftener, however, certain forms of the infinitive and participle, which are seldom or never found as such in the strong verb, though in use in the weak verb and in the kindred dialects, came to be commonly used for the verbal noun; e. g. the participial form *קָטַל*, the infinitives of the (Aramaic) form *מִקְטַל* (as a *noun* also *מִקְטָל*), further *קָטְלָה*, *קָטְלָהּ*, *קָטְלָהּ*, *קָטְלָהּ* (§ 45 d), &c. Others (as the Arabic shows) are properly intensive forms of the participle.
- b* 2. As regards their meaning, it follows from the nature of the case that nouns which have the form of the infinitive regularly denote the *action* or *state*, with other closely related ideas, and are therefore mostly *abstract*; while the participial nouns, on the contrary, denote for the most part the *subject* of the action or state, and are therefore *concrete*. Moreover, it is to be noticed, that a particular meaning is attached to many of the special forms of derivative nouns, although it does not appear equally in them all.
- c* Rem. It need not appear strange, when we consider the analogy of other languages, that a noun which in form is properly *abstract* afterwards acquired a *concrete* sense, and vice versa. So in English, we say *his acquaintance*, for the persons with whom he is acquainted; the *Godhead* for God himself; in Hebrew *מוֹרֵעַ* *acquaintance* and an *acquaintance*.
- d* The inner connexion in thought between Semitic noun-forms and the corresponding verbal forms is investigated in the works of De Lagarde and Barth (see the titles at the head of § 79) on very different lines, but with many points of agreement. De Lagarde starts from the fact that language consists of sentences. A sentence which consists of only *one* word is called a verb, and anything which serves as a complement to it is a noun. The oldest form of the sentence is the imperative. Closely related to it are three kinds of sentences of the nature of verbal forms, differing according as the property of the particular object of sense is to be represented as invariable (form *qatula*), or as liable to change (form *qatila*), or, finally, as a circumstance which takes place before our eyes (form *qatala*). Like the imperative, these three forms of sentences have also been transformed into nouns, by means of certain phonetic changes,—especially by the omission of the final vowels and the addition of different terminations to the last consonant of the stem. But just as the forms of the verbal sentence undergo numerous modifications (in the tenses, moods, and conjugations), so also do the nouns, sometimes by assimilation of the unessential to the characteristic vowel (*qatul*, *qitil*), sometimes by the lengthening of the characteristic vowel (*qatûl*, *qatîl*, *qatâl*), or else through the displacement of the accent and the consequent reduction of the noun to a monosyllabic form (*qatl*, *qull*, *qittl*), or, finally, by their being formed from the derived stems (or conjugations), e. g. *qattal*, *qattâl*; *qittil*, *qittâl*, &c. Further modifications arise from the use of the various imperfect

and infinitive forms, and also from the employment of the prefix *m*. Lastly, *denominalia* are formed from *deverbalia* by appending certain suffixes.

De Lagarde does not, however, claim to be able to show in the case of each particular noun the sense it conveyed in primitive times; the origin of a number of nouns can now no longer be detected. In those, however, which are clearly derived from verbs, the original meaning is chiefly determined by the characteristic vowel.

Barth's system is based on the thesis that 'all Semitic nouns, adjectives, and participles are derived from either the perfect or the imperfect stem'.

Thus, e.g. קָטַל is the infinitive of the perfect stem, קָטַל the infinitive of the imperfect stem, שָׁבַב infinitive of יָשַׁב, &c. In dissyllabic noun-forms the second vowel is always alone characteristic and essential, the first vowel unessential, and therefore variable. Further modifications of the simple form are effected by strengthening (sharpening) the second or third consonant, by lengthening the characteristic vowel (instead of which, however, the feminine termination may also be used), or by 'metaplasm', i. e. by the use of noun-forms derived from one of the two intransitive stems for the other, e. g. *qull* for *qil*, and vice versa.

In nouns of the perfect stem, the vowels *i* and *u* indicate intransitive formations, the vowel *a* a transitive sense. In nouns of the imperfect stem on the contrary, *u* and *i*, being characteristic vowels, indicate a transitive and *a* an intransitive sense: for *yagtilū* is imperfect of the transitive perfect *qatala*, and *yagtilū* imperfect of the intransitive perfects *qatila* and *qatula*, &c. This explains how nouns, apparently identical in form, may yet in sense belong to different classes: a *qul*-form from a *u*-imperfect has a transitive meaning, but the same form from a *u*-perfect has an intransitive meaning. This double system of perfect and imperfect forms runs through the whole scheme of noun-formation, not only the forms connected with the conjugations, but also the forms with prefixes and suffixes.

Against the whole theory it has been urged that it postulates for the development of the language a much too abstract mechanism, and further, that the meanings of words as we find them may in many cases be due to a modification of the original sense. But though many of the details (e.g. the alleged unessential character of the vowel of the first syllable) remain doubtful, yet the agreement between the characteristic vowel of certain noun formations and that of the perfect or imperfect stem, is supported by such a number of incontestable instances, that there can be no doubt as to a systematic, intimate connexion between the two. At the same time it must be admitted that De Lagarde has put forward many important and suggestive points, and both scholars agree in laying stress on *one* characteristic vowel as indicative of the meaning.

§ 84^a. Nouns derived from the Simple Stem.

Preliminary remark.—From the statement made above, § 83 *d*, it follows that *a* an external similarity between forms is no proof of their similar origin, and, vice versa, external difference does not exclude the possibility of their being closely related both in origin and meaning.

I. Nouns with One Vowel, originally Short.

R. Růžicka, 'Beiträge zur Erklärung der nomina segolata,' in *Sitz.-ber. d. böhmischen Ges. d. Wiss.*, Prag, 1904.

1. Nouns with one of the three short vowels after the first radical: *present* ground-form *qāṭl*, *qīṭl*, *quṭl*.

The supposition of *monosyllabic* ground-forms appeared to be required by the character of forms now existing in Hebrew, as well as in Arabic, &c. But there are strong reasons for believing that at least a large proportion of these forms go back to original dissyllabic bases with a short vowel in each syllable. When formative additions were made, the vowel of the 2nd syllable

was dropped, i.e. before case-endings in Assyrian and early Arabic, and before pronominal suffixes in Hebrew. From the forms thus produced, the bases *gaṭl*, *giṭl*, *quṭl* have been assumed, although they never appear in Hebrew except in the singular and then in connexion with suffixes.

In support of this view of a large number of original dissyllabic bases, we must not, however, appeal to the Sēghöl or Pathah under the 2nd consonant of the existing developed forms, קָפַר, יָרַע, &c. These are in no sense survivals or modifications of an original full vowel in the 2nd syllable, but are mere helping-vowels (§ 28 e) to make the monosyllabic forms pronounceable,¹ and consequently disappear when no longer needed. Under certain circumstances even (e.g. in קִשְׁטִי) they are not used at all. Actual proofs of such original toneless full vowels in the 2nd syllable of existing Segholates are—

1. Forms like Arab. *mālik*, for which rarely *malik*, corresponding to the Hebrew ground-form; cf. De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, p. 72 ff.

2. In Hebrew יָרַךְ, יָרֵךְ, קָפַר, פָּתַח, the connective forms of יָרַךְ, יָרֵךְ, &c., which latter can only come from ground-forms *gāḏir*, *yārik*, *kābīd*, *kātip*.

3. The forms treated under e, which are in many ways related to the Segholates proper, in so far as they are to be referred to original dissyllabic bases.

4. The plurals of Hebrew Segholates, since, with very rare exceptions, they take *Qameṣ* under the 2nd radical before the termination יִם—, fem. וֹת—,

of the absolute state, as מְלָכִים, מְלָכוֹת, סִפְרִים, &c. This *Qameṣ* (see note 1 on § 26 e) can only be due to a lengthening of an original short vowel in the 2nd syllable, and hence it would seem as though the vowel were always *ä*. This is impossible from what has been said, especially under 1 and 2. Hence the explanation of the consistent occurrence of *Qameṣ* in the plurals of all Segholates can only be that the regularly formed plurals (i.e. from singulars with original *ä* in the 2nd syllable) became the models for all the others, and ultimately even for some really monosyllabic forms.²

(a) From the strong stem the above three ground-forms are further developed to קָטַל, קָטַל, קָטַל (cf. § 27 r and in § 93 the explanations of Paradigm I, a-c); without a helping vowel (§ 28 d) קִשְׁטִי *truth*. If the second

¹ According to Delitzsch (*Assyr. Gram.*, p. 157 f.) the same is true in Assyrian of the corresponding *gaṭl*-forms. Without case-endings they are *kalab*, *šamas*, *aban* (= קָלַב, שָׁמַשׁ, אָבָן), with case-endings *kalbu*, *šamsu*, *abnu*.

On the other hand, acc. to Sievers, *Metrik*, i. 261, Hebrew ground-forms probably have a twofold origin: they are shortened according to Hebrew rules partly from old absolute forms like *kālbū*, *sifru*, *quḏšu*, and partly from old construct-forms like the Assyrian types *kalab*, *sifir*, *quḏuš*.

² On the other hand, Ungnad, *ZA*. 1903, p. 333 ff., rejecting all previous explanations, maintains that the *a* in *m'läkhim*, *m'läkhōih* is inserted merely to facilitate the pronunciation. From *gaṭlim* arose *gaṭ'lim*, then *gaṭalim* and finally *q'ṭalim*. See, however, Nöldeke, 'Zur semit. Pluralendung,' *ZA*. 1904, p. 68 ff., who points out that the Semitic nouns *fa'l*, *fi'l*, *fu'l* with their corresponding feminines *fa'la*, &c., on assuming the plural termination commonly take an *a* before the 3rd radical, but that no satisfactory account can be given for it. M. Margolis, 'The plural of Segolates' (*Proc. of the Philol. Assoc. of the Pacific Coast*, San Francisco, 1903, p. 4 ff.), and S. Brooks, *Vestiges of the broken plural in Hebrew*, Dublin, 1883, explain *m'läkhim* as a *pluralis fractus*.

³ It is worthy of notice that St. Jerome also (cf. Siegfried, *ZAW*. iv. 76) frequently represents the vowel of the first syllable by *a*, e.g. *gader*, *aben*, *ader*, *areb*, for גָּדַר, אָבָן, אָדַר, חָרַב, but *cedem*, *secel*, *deber*, &c., for שָׂדֶה, קֶדֶם, דֶּבַר, &c.

or third radical be a guttural, a helping *Pathah* takes the place of the helping *Seghōl*, according to § 22 d, e. g. זֶרַע *seed*, עֶצֶם *eternity*, פֶּעַל *work*; but with middle ה or ח, note לֶחֶם *bread*, רֶחֶם (as well as רָחֵם) *womb*, אֶהָל *tent*, בָּהֶן *thumb*; so with final א, פָּרָא *a wild ass*, &c.; with a middle guttural also the modification of the principal vowel *ā* to *è* does not occur, e. g. נָעַר, רָהַב, לָחֵץ (exceptions, again, לָחֵץ, רָחֵם). On the inflexion, cf. § 93, Paradigm I, a-f, and the explanations. In חַמָּא *sin*, the א has wholly lost its consonantal value.

Examples of feminines: מַלְכָּה (directly from the ground-form *malk*, king), סִתְרָה *a covering* (also סִתָּר), אֹכֶלָּה *food* (also אֹכֶל); with a middle guttural נַעֲרָה *girl*, טְהוּרָה *purity* (also טְהוּר). Cf. § 94, Paradigm I.

(b) From weak stems: (a) from stems ע"ן, e. g. אָף *nose* (from 'ānp, hence C with formative additions, e. g. אָפִי for 'anpī, my nose); עֹז *a she-goat* (ground-form 'inz); fem. חֲטָה *wheat*; (β) from stems ע"ע (§ 93, Paradigm I, l-n); פֶּת *a morsel*, עַם *people* (so, when in close connexion with the next word; unconnected עַם; with article הָעַם, לָעַם, &c.); רַב in the sense of *much*, but רַב *great*, numerous (in close connexion also רַב); רָע *evil*, with the article in close connexion הָרָע, unconnected הָרַע; with the *ā* always lengthened to *ā*, יָם *sea*; fem. חַיָּה *life*, and with attenuation of the *ā* to *ī*, מִדָּה *measure*; from the ground-form qūl, אִם *mother*; fem. מִנָּה *a shearing*; from the ground-form qūl, חֹק *statute*, fem. חֻקָּה. (γ) from stems ע"י (Paradigm I, g and i); מָוֶת *death* (from mā-ut, the *u* passing into the corresponding consonant, as in תוֹךְ *middle*) or contracted יוֹם *day*, שׁוֹט *whip*, שׂוֹר *a bull*; fem. עוֹלָה *perverseness* (also contracted עוֹלָה); from the ground-form qūl, צוֹר *a rock*; fem. סוֹפָה *a storm*. (δ) from stems ע"י (Paradigm I, h); זַיִת *an olive-tree* (with a helping *Hireq* instead of a helping *Seghōl*) from zā-it, the *i* passing into the corresponding consonant; or contracted חֵיק *bosom*, חֵיל 2 K 18¹⁷ (elsewhere חַיִּל) *host*; fem. שֵׁיבָה *grey hair*; from the ground-form qūl, דִּין *judgement*; fem. בִּינָה *understanding*. (ε) from stems ל"ה (Paradigm I, k); partly forms such as בָּכָה *weeping*, הִנָּה *murmuring*, נָתַה *a present*, קָצָה *the end*, partly such as אֶרִי, בָּבִי *a lion* (ground-form bākū, 'āry); cf. also the forms from stems originally ל"י, שָׁחָה *swimming* (ground-form sāḥw); fem. שָׁחָה *rest*, נָאָה *exaltation*; from stems ל"י, אֶלִיָּה *a fat tail*, and with attenuation of *ā* to *ī* שְׁבִיָּה *captivity*, also שְׁבִית, formed no doubt directly from the masc. שָׁבִי with the fem. termination ת; from the ground-form qūl, חָצִי (from ḥisy); fem. חֲרוּהָ *joy*, עָרִיהָ and עָרוּהָ *nakedness*; from the ground-form qūl, בָּהוּ (from bōhw) *waste*, תָּהוּ *emptiness*; דָּלִי, for דָּלִי, *bucket*; fem. אֶנְיָה *a ship* (directly from אֶנִי *a fleet*).

The masculines as well as the feminines of these *segholate* forms may have *d* either an *abstract* or a *concrete* meaning. In the form קָטַל the *passive* or at any rate the *abstract* meaning is by far the more common (e. g. נָעַר *youthfulness*, abstract of נָעַר *boy*; אֹכֶל *food*, &c.).¹

¹ M. Lambert also (*REJ.* 1896, p. 18 ff.), from statistics of the *Segholates*, arrives at the conclusion that the *qatīl*-form is especially used for concretes (in nouns without gutturals he reckons twenty concretes as against two abstracts), and the *qūl*-form, and less strictly the *qūl*, for abstracts.

e 2. Nouns with one of the three short vowels under the second radical (present ground-form *q^etāl*, *q^etīl*, *q^etūl*), e. g. דְּבַשׁ *honey*, דִּי *sickness*, חֶתֶת *terror*; and so always with middle א, בָּאֵר *a well*, וּבֹא *a wolf*, בָּאֵשׁ *stench*. In reality these forms, like the segholates mentioned in No. 1 (see above, *a*), are, probably, for the most part to be referred to original *dissyllabic* forms, but the tone has been shifted from its original place (the penultima) on to the ultima. Thus *dibāš* (originally *dibaš*) as ground-form of דְּבַשׁ is supported both by the Hebrew דְּבַשְׁי (with suffix of the first person), and by the Arabic *dibs*, the principal form; *bi'ir* (according to Philippi with assimilation of the vowel of the second syllable to that of the first) as ground-form of בָּאֵר is attested by the Arabic *bi'r*; for בָּאֵשׁ (Arabic *bu's*) similarly a ground-form *bu'ūš* may be inferred, just as a ground-form *qūtūl* underlies the infinitives of the form קָטַל.¹

II. Nouns with an original Short Vowel in both Syllables.

f 3. The ground-form *qātāl*, fem. *qātālāt*, developed in Hebrew to קָטַל (§ 93, Paradigm II, *a, b*) and קָטְלָה (§§ 94, 95, Paradigm II, *a, b*), mostly forms intransitive adjectives, as חָכָם *wise*, נָדָשׁ *new*, יָשָׁר *upright*; but also substantives, as דְּבָר *a word*, and even abstracts, as אָשָׁם *guilt*, רָעָב *hunger*, שִׂבְעַת *satiety*; in the fem. frequently abstract, as צִדְקָה² *righteousness*; with an initial guttural אֶרֶץ *earth*.—Of the same formation from verbs ע"ע are בָּדָד *alone*, עָנָן *cloud*; passive חָלַל *pierced*.—In verbs ל"ה a final *Yôdh* is almost always rejected, and the *ā* of the second syllable lengthened to *ē*. Thus שָׂדֵי *field*, after rejection of the *'* and addition of ה as a vowel-letter, becomes שָׂדֶה (cf. § 93, Paradigm II, *f*); fem. e. g. שָׁנָה *year*; cf. § 95, Paradigm II, *c*. From a verb ל"ו the strong form עָנָן *afflicted* occurs.

g 4. The ground-form *qātīl*, fem. *qātīlāt*, developed to קָטַל (§ 93, Paradigm II, *c-e*) and קָטְלָה, is frequently used as participle of verbs middle *e* (§ 50 *b*), and hence mostly with an intransitive meaning; cf. זָקֵן *old*, *an old man*; כָּבֵד *heavy*; fem. בָּהֵמָה *cattle*, אֲפֵלָה and חֹשֶׁכָה *darkness*.—From verbs פ"י irregularly, רָלִיזְתִּי *the branches of it*, Jer 11¹⁶, &c., generally referred to a *sing.* דְּלִית (stem דָּלָה), and הָרִיזְתִּי Ho 14¹ *their women with child* (from הָרָה, *st. constr.* הָרָת, plur. *st. absol. and constr.* הָרוֹת).—From a verb ל"ו with consonantal Wāw: שָׁלוּ *at ease*, incorrectly written *plene* שָׁלוּ Jb 21²³.

h 5. The ground-form *qātūl*, developed to קָטַל (also written קָטוּל), generally forms adjectives, e. g. אִים *terrible*, בָּרָד *piebald*, מְתוֹק *sweet*, נָקָד *speckled*, עֵבֶת *interwoven*, עוֹלָם *round*, עֶמֶק *deep*, עֵקֶב *hilly*, צָהָב *golden*; קָטָן *small*, only in *sing. masc.*, with a parallel form קָטְנָה of the class treated under *f*, fem. קָטְנָה, plur. קָטְנִים. These forms are not to be confounded with those in No. III, from

¹ On this theory cf. Stade, *Hebräische Grammatik*, § 199 *b*; De Lagarde, *Übersicht*, p. 57 *f*.; A. Müller, *ZDMG*. xlv, p. 226, and especially Philippi, *ZDMG*. xlix, p. 208.

² In St. Jerome's time these forms were still pronounced *šadaca* (צִדְקָה), *šaaca* (צַעֲקָה), *nabala* (נָבֻלָה), &c., see Siegfried, *ZAW*. iv. 79. Moreover, the numerous abstracts of this form (e. g. even קִצְפָה *a splintering*, צִוּחָה *a crying*, &c.) are undoubtedly to be regarded (with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 87) as feminines of infinitives of the form *qātāl*, the lengthening of the second syllable being balanced, as in other cases, by the addition of the feminine termination.

the ground-form *qāṭāl*.—Fem. *אֵימָה*, *כְּבוֹדָה* (*glorious*), *עֲבֹתָה*, *עֲנָנָה* (*delicate*), *עֲנָלָה*, *עֲמָקָה*, with sharpening of the third radical, in order to keep the original *ā* short, and similarly in the plurals *בְּרִידִים*, *נְקָרִים*, *עֲנָלִים*, *אֲסָפִים* *stores*, &c.

6. The ground-form *qāṭāl* develops to *קָטַל* (cf. § 93, Paradigm II, Rem. 1), i. e. g. *לֵבָב* *heart*, *עֵנַב* *a bunch of grapes*, *שִׁכָּר* *strong drink*; from a verb *לָ"ה*, probably of this class is *רָעָה*, generally contracted to *רַע* *friend*, ground-form *ri'ay*: the full form is preserved in *רַעְיוֹהוּ* *his friend*, for *רַעְיֹהוּ*.

III. Nouns with an original Short Vowel in the First and a Long Vowel in the Second Syllable.

7. The ground-form *qāṭāl* in Hebrew always develops to the form *קָטַל*, the *k* becoming an obscure *ō*. The fact that this form is also written *קָטַל* must not lead to the confusion of these forms with those mentioned in No. 5, from the ground-form *qāṭāl*.¹ Moreover the *qāṭāl*-class includes forms of various origin, and therefore of various meaning, as (a) intransitive adjectives like *גָּדוֹל* *great*, *קָדוֹשׁ* *holy*, fem. *גְּדוּלָה*, the short vowel becoming *Š^ewā*, whereas in *גָּדוֹל*, &c., before the tone it is lengthened to *ā*; (b) the infinitives absolute of the form *קָטַל* (§ 45 a) as representing the abstract idea of the verb, and abstract substantives like *כְּבוֹד* *honour*, *שָׁלוֹם* *peace* (Arab. *sālām*); (c) substantives and adjectives in an active sense, as *בַּחוּן* *assayer* (of metals), *עוֹשֵׁק* *an oppressor*, *חֲמוּץ* *oppressing*; in the feminine *בְּגוּדָה* *treacherous* Jer 3^{7.10}, the irregular retention of the *ā* in the third syllable from the end is no doubt to be explained, with Brockelmann, from Aramaic influence, the punctuator having in mind the Aramaic nomen agentis *qāṭōl*.

8. The ground-form *qāṭāl* develops to *קָטַל* (cf. § 93, Paradigm IV, a and b).^l Here also forms of various origin and meaning are to be distinguished: (a) adjectives used substantivally with a passive meaning to denote duration in a state, as *אֲסִיר* *a prisoner*, *קֹשֵׁט* *an anointed one*. These proper *qāṭāl*-forms are parallel to the purely passive *qāṭāl*-forms (see m), but others are due to a strengthening of original *qāṭāl*-forms. These are either (b) intransitive in meaning, as *צָעִיר* *small*, and, from *לָ"י* stems, *נָקִי* *pure*, *עָנִי* *poor* (see § 93 sv), or (c) active, as *נְבִיא* *a speaker* (prophet), *פֶּקִיד* *an overseer*.—Of a different kind again (according to De Lagarde, infinitives) are (d) forms like *אֲסִיף* *the ingathering*, *בְּצִיר* *vintage*, *חֲרִישׁ* *ploughing time*, *קִצִּיר* *harvest*. On *qāṭāl*-forms with a kindred meaning, cf. § 84^b f.

9. The ground-form *qāṭāl* develops to *קָטַל*. As in the *qāṭāl* and *qāṭāl*-forms m (see k and l), so here forms of various kinds are to be distinguished: (a) *qāṭāl*-forms proper, with passive meaning, especially all the passive participles of Qal; fem. e.g. *בְּתוּלָה* *virgin* (properly *secluded*). On the other hand, by strengthening an original *qāṭāl*-form we get (b) certain stative adjectives (§ 50 f), as *אִנּוּשׁ* *incurable*, *עֲצוּם* *strong*, *עָרוּם* *subtil*, or even transitive, as *אֲחִזּוֹ* *holding*; (c) active substantives, as *יֹקֵשׁ* *a fowler*. Further, some of the forms mentioned in § 84^b g belong to this class; see above, the remark on l.

10. The ground-form *qāṭāl* or *qūṭāl*² in Hebrew changes the *i* to vocal *Š^ewā*, n

¹ In Na 1³ only the *Q^erē* requires *גָּדַלְ* (in the constr. state) for the *Kethibh* *גָּדוֹל*.

² On the *fu'āl*-forms (regarded by Wellhausen as original diminutives) see Nöldeke, *Beiträge* (Strassb. 1904), p. 30 ff. He includes among them *נְעֻת* *toro*, and *טְהָרִים* *hemorrhoids*.

and develops to קָטַל (cf. § 93, Paradigm IV, c) or קָטוּל, with *ā* obscured to *ō* (as above, k). Cf. נִשְׁאָר remnant, יָקָר honour, בָּתָב book (Arab. *kitāb*), קָרַב war (the last three probably loan-words from the Aramaic); of the other form, חֶלֶם a dream, חֲמֹר an ass (Arab. *ḥimār*), אֱלֹהִים God (Arab. *'ilāh*); with ■ prosthetic (§ 19 m), אֶזְרוֹעַ arm (twice: usually זְרוֹעַ); fem. בִּשְׂשׂוּרָה good news (Arab. *bīšārūt*); עֲבוּדָה service, כְּתָבָה (Arab. *kitābāt*) tattooing.

o 11. The ground-form *qīṭīl* seems to occur e.g. in Hebrew אֵילִים foolish, אֵילִים vanity, בָּדִיל lead, בָּסִיל a fool, חֲזִיר a swine (the prop. name חֲזִיר points to the ground-form *qīṭīl*, cf. Arab. *ḥinzīr*).

p 12. The ground-form *qīṭūl* or *qūṭūl*, Hebr. קָטוּל, e.g. גְּבוּל a boundary, לְבִישׁ a garment; fem. גְּבוּרָה strength, אֱמוּנָה faithfulness.

q Rem. When the forms *qēṭūl* and *qēṭōl* begin with *ṣ*, they almost invariably take in the singular a *Ṣere* under the *ṣ* instead of the ordinary *Ḥateph-Ṣeḡhōl*; cf. אֲבוֹם a crib, אֶטָּן thread, אֱמוּן faithful, אֹזֶן hyssop, אֶזְרוֹר a waist-band, אֶסָּר a bond, אֶפְסֹד an 'ephod'; cf. § 23 h, and the analogous cases of *Ṣere* for *Ḥateph-Ṣeḡhōl* in verbal forms § 52 n, § 63 p, § 76 d.

IV. Nouns with a Long Vocal in the First Syllable and originally a Short Vowel in the Second Syllable.

r 13. The ground-form *qāṭāl*, in Hebrew, always changes the *ā* into an obscure *ō*, קָטַל (קָטַל), e.g. עוֹלָם (§ 93, Paradigm III, a), Arab. *'ālam*, eternity; חוֹתָם (Arab. *ḥātām*) a seal (according to Barth a loan-word of Egyptian origin), fem. חוֹתָמָה (from *ḥōtāmī*); תוֹלַע worm (unless from a stem וּלַע, like תוֹשֵׁב from וִשַׁב; see the analogous cases in § 85 b). On the participles *Qal* of verbs לָחַץ (§ 93, Paradigm III, c), cf. § 75 e; on the feminines of the participles *Qal*, which are formed with the termination ת, see below, s.

Rem. Of a different kind (probably from a ground-form *qawṭal*) are such forms as אֶפֶס (or אֶפֶן Ez 10⁹ in the same verse) a wheel; צוּץ a young bird, דוֹנָן wax, &c.

s 14. The ground-form *qāṭīl* also becomes in Hebrew almost invariably קָטַל (קָטַל). Besides participles active masc. *Qal* this class includes also feminines of the form קָטַלְתָּ, if their ground-form *qōṭalt* (§ 69 c) goes back to an original *qāṭīl*. The substantives of this form, such as כֹּהֵן priest (Arab. *kāhīn*), were also originally participles *Qal*. The fem. of the substantives has *ē* (lengthened from *i*) retained before the tone, e.g. יֹלְדָה a woman in travail (cf. also בְּגֵדָה the treacherous woman, Jer 3⁸; הַצֹּלֵעָה her that halteth, Mi 4^{6 f}, Zp 3¹⁰; כֹּחֲלָה a buckler, ψ 91⁴); the participles as a rule have the form יֹלְדָה, &c., the original *i* having become *Ṣewā*; however, the form with *Ṣere* occurs also in the latter, Is 29^{6,8}, 34⁹, ψ 68²⁶, 118¹⁶ (all in principal pause; in subordinate pause 2 S 13²⁰, Is 33¹⁴; with a conjunctive accent, Ct 1⁶).

t 15. The ground-form *qūṭāl*, Hebrew קָטַל (as יַבֵּל river, Jer 17⁸) or קָטַל e.g. עֵינָב a pipe, commonly עֵנָב, and to be so read, with Baer, also in ψ 150⁴, not עֵנָב.

V. Nouns with a Long Vocal in each Syllable.

u 16. קִיטוּל, e.g. קִיטוּר smoke. The few forms of this kind are probably derived from the ground-form *qīṭāl* (*qīṭāl*?), i. e. the original *ā* has become an obscure *ō*.

§ 84^b. *Formation of Nouns from the Intensive Stem.*

This includes all forms which have arisen, either through the *a* doubling of the middle radical, or the repetition of one or of two consonants of the simple stem.

VI. *Nouns with the Middle Consonant sharpened.*

As in the corresponding verbal stems (cf. § 52 *f*), so also in some noun-formations of this class, the Dageš in the second radical expresses an intensification of the idea of the stem, either emphasizing the energy of the action or relation, or else indicating a longer continuance of the relation or state. Other nouns of this character are evidently only by-forms of the nouns derived from the simple stem, which were treated in the last section: cf. the instances adduced under *f* and *g*, and Barth, *Nominalbildung*, Introd., p. x.

17. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl* is mostly lengthened in Hebrew to קָטַל; cf. *b* אֵיל *a stag*, fem. אֵילָה, constr. st. אֵילָת (from 'äyyālt); cf. also the fem. (originating from *Qal*) לֶהֱבֶה *a flame* (according to § 27 *q* for *lāhhābhā*), חֲרָבָה *dry land* (for *ḥarrābhā*), דִּלְקָת and קִרְחַת *a burning fever*, יְבֹשָׁה and יְבֹשֶׁת *dry land*, טַבַּעַת *a seal-ring*, שִׁחָפַת *consumption*. Adjectives of this class ('intensified participles of the active verb', Barth, *ibid.*, § 33) are חָפָא *sinful*, נָגַח *went to gore*, קָנָא *jealous*, כָּחַשׁ (for *kaḥḥāš*, by § 22 *c*) *lying*. *Nomina opificum* also, curiously enough, are so treated in Hebrew (at least in the constr. state of the sing.), although the corresponding Arabic form *qāṭṭāl* points to an original (unchangeable) *ā* in the second syllable; cf. גָּנַב *a thief*, דִּין *a judge* (constr. st. דִּיןָ ψ 68⁸), טָבַח *a cook*, חָרַשׁ (for *ḥarrāš*) *artificer* (constr. st. חָרַשׁ, but plur. constr. חָרָשִׁי); פָּרַשׁ *horseman* (for *parrāš*), const. st. פָּרָשׁ Ez 26¹⁰.

18. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl* appears in צָחָה *dry*, נָאָה *haughty* (the *ī* being *C* lengthened to *ē* according to § 22 *c*), if these forms go back to original *siḥḥāy*, *gi'āy*. On the analogy, however, of the adjectives denoting defects (see *d* below), we should rather expect a ground-form *qāṭṭūl*; moreover, 'iwalt, ground-form of the fem. אִוְלָת *foolishness*, goes back to an original *iwwalt*, see § 69 *c*.

19. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl* and *qāṭṭūl*; cf. the fem. בִּפְסָמַת *spelt*, בִּתְנָת *coat*.

20. The ground-form *qāṭṭūl*; from the intensive stem, the infinitives *Pi'el* of *d* the form קָטַל.

21. The ground-form *qāṭṭūl*, in Hebrew lengthened to קָטַל. Of this form are a considerable number of adjectives which denote a bodily or mental fault or defect. Cf. אֵפֶר *disabled*, אֵלֶם *dumb*, גֵּבֶן *hump-backed*, עֵוֶר *blind*, חֵרֵשׁ *deaf* (for *ḥirrēš*), פֶּפֶחַ *lame*, קָרַח *bald*, עָקָשׁ *perverse*; פֶּקַח *open-eyed* follows the same analogy.

22. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, cf. the remarks in *b* above, on the *nomina opificum*; moreover, to this class belong infinitives *Pi'el* of the Aramaic form בִּקְרָה *a searching out*; בִּקְשָׁה *a request*; with middle guttural (see § 22 *c*) נִאָצָה *contumely*; but cf. also נִאָצוּתִיךְ Ez 35¹², with full lengthening of the original *ā* before *ā*; נִחְמָה *comfort*. From the attenuation of the *ā* of this form to *i*, arises undoubtedly:

23. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, e. g. אֶכָּר *husbandman* (Arab. 'ākkār).

24. The ground-form *qāṭṭōl*, most probably only a variety of the form *qāṭṭāl* with the *ā* attenuated to *i* (as in No. 23), and the *ā* obscured to *ō* (as in *n* and

r); cf. **נָבוֹר** *hero* (Arab. *gābbār*), **יָפוֹר** *caviller*, **צָפוֹר** (*piper* or *chirper*) a *bird*, **שָׁבוֹר** *drunkard*. On the other hand, **יָלוֹד** *born* probably arises from *yullôd*, an old participle passive of *Qal*, the *û* being dissimilated in the sharpened syllable before *ô*: so Barth, *ibid.*, p. 41 f.

f 25. The ground-form *qāṭṭûl*, **קָטִיל**, almost exclusively of persons, who possess some quality in an intensive manner, e.g. **אָבִיר** *strong*, **צָדִיק** *righteous*, **בָּרִיחַ** *fugitive* (for *barri^{ah}*), **עָרִיץ** *violent* (for *‘ārîṣ*).

That some of these are only by-forms of the *qāṭṭûl*-class (see above, remark on a), appears from the constr. st. **פָּרִיץ** *ravenous*, Is 35⁹ (but **פָּרִיצִים**, **פָּרִיצִי** always), and according to Barth (*ibid.*, 35 a) also from the constr. st. **אָבִיר** (but also **אָבִיר** I S 21⁸) of **אָבִיר**. However, the form **אָבִיר**, as a name of God, may be intentionally differentiated from **אָבִיר**, a poetic term for the bull.

In the same way **אָסִיר** *prisoner*, **סָרִיס** *eunuch* (constr. st. always **סָרִיס**, plur. **סָרִיסִים**, constr. st. **סָרִיסִי** Gn 40⁷, but in the book of Esther always **סָרִיסִי**, with suffix **סָרִיסִיו**, &c.), and **עָתִיק** *weaned*, may be regarded as by-forms of the *qāṭṭûl*-class with passive meaning, see § 84^a l.

g 26. The ground-form *qāṭṭûl*, **קָטִיל**, e.g. **חַנּוּן** *gracious*, **רַחוּם** *compassionate* (with virtual strengthening of the ח), **חָרוּץ** *diligent* (for *harrûṣ*), probably, again, to a large extent by-forms of the *qāṭṭûl*-class, § 84^a m. The same applies to substantives like **אָשֶׁר** *a step* (in **אֲשֶׁרִי**, as well as **אֲשֶׁרִי**, &c.), **עַמּוּד** *pillar*; fem. **חֲבִירָה** *a stripe* (also **חֲבִירָתִי** *security*: cf. Barth, *ibid.*, § 84.

h 27. The ground-form *qāṭṭûl*; besides the infinitives absolute *Pi'el* of the form **קָטַל**, also **קָנוֹא** *jealous* (as well as **קָנָא**, an obscured form of *qāṭṭûl*, see e).

i 28. The ground-form *qāṭṭûl*, **קָטִיל**, e.g. **צָפוּי** *a coating of metal*, **שָׁלוּם** *requital*, **שָׁקִי** *drink*, **שָׁקִיץ** *detestable thing*; with concrete meaning **לָמוּד** *a disciple*, **עוֹז** *strong*; frequently in the plural in an abstract sense, as **נִדְוָפִים** *reproach*, **מִלְאִים** *filling* (the induction of a priest), **נִחְמִים** *consolations, compassion*, **שִׁבְלִים** *bereavement*, **שִׁלְחִים** *dismissal*, **שִׁמְרִים** *observance*.

VII. Nouns with the Third Consonant repeated.

k 29. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, e.g. **שָׁאֲנָן** *quiet*, fem. **שָׁאֲנָנָה** (with sharpening of the second *Nûn*, in order to keep the preceding vowel short); **רָעֵנָן** *green*, plur. **רָעֵנִים**.

l 30. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, in Hebrew **קָטַל**; of this form are e.g. the infinitives *Pi'el* (prop. *Pa'el*), cf. § 55 d.

m 31. The ground-form *qāṭṭûl*; so the plur. **גִּבְנָנִים** *ridges* (with sharpening of the *Nûn*, as in No. 29).

32. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, in **פָּרְתַח** *a brood*.

33. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, in **אֶמְלֵל** *faint*.

34. The ground-form *qāṭṭûl*, e.g. **עֲבָטִים** *plunder*, **כְּנִיר** *rain-storm*, **שִׁפְרִיר** *glittering tapestry*, Jer 43¹⁰ *Q^{er}*; with attenuation of the *ā* to *i* **בְּמִרְרִים** *all that maketh black*, Jb 3⁵ (but the better reading is **בְּמִרְרִי**).

35. The ground-form *qāṭṭûl*, e.g. **שִׁפְרִיר** Jer 43¹⁰ *K^{eth}*; **נֶאֱפֹפִים** *adulteries*.

VIII. Nouns with the Second and Third Consonants repeated.

n 36-39. *Q^{er}āṭṭāl*, *q^{er}āṭṭûl*, *q^{er}āṭṭûl*; *q^{er}āṭṭûl*, *q^{er}āṭṭûl* (in fem. and plur. often with the last consonant sharpened for the reason given in a above); cf. **הַפְּכָפֶךְ**.

crooked, חֲלָקִיּוֹת slippery places, עֲקָלְקָלוֹת crooked (ways); פְּתִילָתִל tortuous; also words denoting colours, אֲדָמָדֶם (Lv 13^{42,49} in pause) reddish, fem. אֲדָמָדֶמֶת, plur. אֲדָמָדֶמֶת; יִרְקָק greenish, plur. fem. יִרְקָקָת; q^etalīl, יִפְיָפִיָּה very fair (to be read in Jer 46²⁰ for יִפְיָפִיָּה); q^etalūl, נִשְׁחָחָחָת (fem.) blackish; אִסְפָּפָף a rabble (augmented from אָסַף collected). From a verb פָּי with aphaeresis of the initial syllable פָּאִפְּאִים offspring. Moreover, of the same form, probably, is חֲצוּצָרָה a trumpet (for חֲצוּצָרָה, cf. § 55 e). Also in Is 2²⁰ לְחַפְּרָרוֹת is to be read instead of לְחַפְּרָרוֹת (from the sing. חֲפַרְפָּרָה a digging or burrowing animal, perhaps the mole). But פִּתְחִיקוֹן opening, Is 61¹ (ed. Mant., Baer, Ginsb. פִּתְחִיקוֹן), is an evident mistake due to dittography; read פִּתְחִיקוֹן as in 42⁷.

IX. Nouns in which the Whole (Biliteral) Stem is repeated.

Naturally this class includes only isolated forms of the stems ע"ו and ע"ע O (on פִּיפִּיּוֹת see § 96 under פֶּה). Thus:—

40. גִּלְגָּל a wheel, and, with attenuation of the first ā to ī, גִּלְגָּל (from גִּלְגָּל); fem. חֲלָחָלָה anguish (from חוּל or חִיל); כִּכָּר (for kirkar) a talent; cf. also בּוֹכָב a star (from kāwkāb, Arabic kaukāb, for כִּכָּבָב), מַטְפָּטָפָת bands, for מַטְפָּטָפָת; צִלְצִל probably a whirring locust.
41. פִּלְפֵּל infin. Filpēl (prop. Palpūl) from פוּל; fem. מְלִילָה a hurling (from p טוּל).
42. כִּכָּר perhaps a ruby (for kādkūd), from כוּר.
43. קִדְקִדָּה the crown of the head (for qūdqud), from קוּד; fem. גִּלְגָּלָת a skull (for gūlgūl), from גִּלְגָּל.
44. זִרְזִיר girded, from זרר; בִּכְבֵּיב a bottle, from בָּקָק; פִּרְפִּירִים fattened birds (?).

§ 85. Nouns with Preformatives and Affirmatives.

These include nouns which are directly derived from verbal forms a having preformatives (*Hiph'il*, *Hoph'al*, *Hithpa'el*, *Niph'al*, &c.), as well as those which are formed with other preformatives (א, ז, מ, ט, נ), and finally those which are formed with affirmatives. The quadriliterals and quinqueliterals also are taken in connexion with these formations, inasmuch as they arise almost always by the addition or insertion of one or two consonants to the trilateral stem.

X. Nouns with Preformatives.

45. Nouns with א prefixed. Cf. the substantives with א prosthetic (§ 19 m), b such as אֶזְרוֹעַ arm (Jer 32²¹, Jb 31²²; elsewhere always זְרוֹעַ); אֶצְבַּע a finger, אֶרְבֶּה a locust, אֶזְרוֹף fist (others mattock, or clod), אֶשְׁמֹרֶה or אֶשְׁמֹרֶת a watch. In these examples the א is a 'euphonic' prefix (Barth, *ibid.*, § 150 b); in other cases it is 'essential'; cf. especially the adjectives, אֶכְזֹב deceitful, אֶכָּזֵר cruel, אֶיֶּתֶן perennial (for 'aitan) [=the Arab. 'elative', used for expressing the compar. and superl. degrees]. The fem. אֶפְרָה fragrant part¹ (of the meal-

¹ Or perhaps more correctly with Jacob, ZAW. 1897, p. 79, 'declaration,' i. e. the part of the meal-offering which 'announces the sacrifice and its object'.

offering) is a *nomen verbale* of *Hiph'il*, answering to the Aramaic infinitive of the causal stem ('*Aph'el*), hence with suff. **אֶפְרָתָהּ** Lv 2², &c.

C 46. Nouns with ה prefixed. Besides the ordinary infinitives of *Hiph'il* **הִקְטִיל** and **הִקְטִיל**, of *Niph'al* **הִקְטִיל** (for *hing.*), and of the conjugations formed with the prefix **הִתְ**, this class also includes some rare *nomina verbalia* derived from *Hiph'il* (cf. § 72 z), viz. **הִכָּרָה** *appearance* (from **יָכַר**), Is 3⁹; **הִנָּפָה** *a swinging* (from **נָפָה**), [Is 30²⁸; **הִנָּחָה** *a rest-giving*, Est 2¹⁸]; **הִצָּלָה** *deliverance* (from **יָצַל**), [Est 4¹⁴ an Aram. form: cf. **הִזָּרָה** Dn 5²⁰]; perhaps also **הִיכָל** *palace*, from *haikāl*, unless it is borrowed from the Assyrian; see the Lexicon.

d 47. Nouns with י prefixed, as **יָצָהָר** *oil*, **יָלָקוּט** *wallet*, **יָנִשׁוּף** *owl* (?); from verbs י"ו, e. g. **יָקוּם** *a living thing*, **יָתוּר** *a range*; from a verb ע"י **יָרִיב** *an adversary*. Of a different character are the many proper names which have simply adopted the imperfect form, as **יַעֲקֹב**, **יִצְחָק**, &c.

e 48. Nouns with מ prefixed. This *preformative Mēm*, which is no doubt connected with **מִי** *who*, and **מָה** *what* (see § 37 and § 52 c), appears in a very large number of nouns, and serves to express the most varied modifications of the idea of the stem: (1) **מִ** *subjective*, when preformative of the participles *Pi'el*, *Hiph'il*, *Hithpa'el*, and other active conjugations. (2) **מִ** *objective*, when preformative of the participles *Pu'al*, *Hoph'al*, and other passive conjugations, as well as of numerous nouns. (3) **מִ** *instrumental*, as in **מִפֶּתַח** *a key*, &c. (4) **מִ** *local*, as in **מִדְּבָר** *a drive for cattle*, &c.

f As regards the formation of these nouns, it is to be remarked that the preformative **מ** was originally in most cases followed by a short *ä*. This *ä*, however, in a closed syllable is frequently attenuated to *ī*; in an open syllable before the tone it is lengthened to *ā* (so also the *ī*, attenuated from *ä*, is lengthened to *ē*), and in **מִגֶּן** *shield* (with suff. **מִגְנִי**) it even becomes unchangeable *ä*. But in an open syllable which does not stand before the tone, the *ä* necessarily becomes *Sēwā*.

g The following forms are especially to be noticed: (a) ground-form *māqtāl*, in Hebrew **מִקְטָל**,¹ e. g. **מִאֲכָל** *food*; fem. **מַמְלָכָה** *kingdom*, **מִאֲכָלָה** *a knife*, **מִלְאכָה** (for **מִלְאָכָה** by § 23 c) *business*; from a verb **פָּתַן** *a gift*; from verbs **פָּוֵץ**, **מוֹצֵא** *a going forth*, **מוֹשֵׁב** *a seat*; from verbs **פָּטַח**, **מִיטָב** *the best* (from *maïtāb*); with י (or ו) assimilated, **מִצָּע** *a bed*; from verbs **עָסַף**, **מִסָּךְ** *a screen*, and with the shortening of the *ä* under the preformative, **מִמֶּר** *bitterness* (from *māmer* developed to a segholate), fem. **מִשְׁמָה** *desolation*; from a verb **עָזַב**, probably of this class is **מִקוֹם** *place*, the *ä* lengthened to *ā* and obscured to *ō* (Arabic *māqām*); from verbs **לָּה**, **מִרְאָה** *appearance*, **מִעֵן** (for **מִעֲנָה**) *prop. intention*, only in **לְמַעַן** *on account of*, *in order that*.

h (b) Ground-form *miqtāl* (the usual form of the infin. *Qal* in Aramaic), Hebr. **מִקְטָל**, e. g. **מִדְּבָר** (in Jer 2³¹ also, where Baer requires **הַמְדְּבָר**, read with ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c. **הַמְדְּבָר**) *a cattle-drive*, fem. **מִלְחָמָה** *war*, **מִרְכָּבָה** *a chariot* (with *Sēghōl* instead of *ī*, but in constr. st. **מִרְכָּבָתָהּ** Gn 41⁴³; cf. **מִרְחָק** *distance*), **מִשְׁמֶרֶת** *a watch*; from verbs **עָסַב**, **מִסָּב** *surroundings* (from *mī-sāb*; *ī* in the open syllable being lengthened to *ē*; but cf. also **מִשָּׁק** Is 33⁴ as constr. *stute* from **שָׁקַק** with sharpening of the first radical; cf. § 67 g); from verbs **לָּה**, **מִקְנָה** *a possession*, fem. **מִקְנָהּ**.

¹ In **מִמְחָקִים** Ct 5¹⁶, Neh 8¹⁰, the first syllable is artificially opened to avoid the cacophony; on the *ä* of the second syllable cf. § 93 ee.

(c) Ground-form *māqtāl*, Hebr. מִקְטָל, e.g. מִשְׁעָן *a support* (fem. מִשְׁעָנָה), *i* מִסְגֵּר *a smith*, מַעֲשֵׂר *a tithe*; fem. מִכְשָׁלָה *a ruin*; from a verb פָּן, מִגְפָּה *an overthrow*, מַצָּבָה *a pillar*; from verbs עָוַע, מָגֵן *a shield*; fem. מִגִּלָּה *a roll* (from גָּלַל), מִאֲרָה *a curse* (for *m'irra* from אָרַר); from a verb פָּוַשׁ, מִוִּקֶּשׁ *a snare* (from *māwqīš*).

(d) Ground-form *māqtāl*, Hebr. מִקְטָל, e.g. מִסְפָּד *mourning*, מִזְבֵּחַ *an altar* *k* (*place of sacrifice*); from a verb עָע, e.g. מִסֵּב (מִסֵּב?) *concessus*; (e) ground-form *māqtāl*, Hebr. מִקְטָל; fem. מִאֲכָלָת *food*, מִשְׁפָּרָת *wages*; from a verb עָע, fem. מִסְכָּה *a covering* (from סָכַף). Also from עָע, according to the Masora, מְעוּזָה *a refuge*, with suffixes מְעוּזִי and מְעוּזִי, plur. מְעוּזִים, but, very probably, most if not all of these forms are to be referred to the stem עוּז *to flee for safety*, and therefore should be written מְעוּזִי, &c. The form מְעוּז, if derived from the stem עוּז, would mean *stronghold*.—Cf. also מְרִירָה *faintness*, developed to a segholate, probably from מְרִירָה, for *mārōkh* from רָכַךְ, like מְרִירָה *soundness of body*, from מָרַם.

With a long vowel in the second syllable: (f) ground-form *maqṭāl*, with *ā* *l* always obscured to *ô*, e.g. מִחְסֹר *want*, מִלְקֹחַ *booty*; from verbs עָוַע, e.g. מִגֹּר *fear*, fem. מִגֹּרָה and מִגֹּרָה (with the *ô* depressed to *û* in a toneless syllable; cf. § 27 n), מְהוּמָה, &c., Is 22⁵. (g) Ground-form *māqtāl*, in Hebr. again מִקְטָל, e.g. מִסְתָּוֵר *a covert*, מִכְשָׁוֶל *a stumbling-block* (cf. above under *i*, *mākhšēlā*); fem. מִכְמֶרֶת *a fishing-net*; (h) the ground-forms *maqṭāl*, *miqtāl* (cf. מִקִּים) are found only in participles *Hiph'il*; the fem. מִבְּלִיגִית *cheerfulness*, is a denominative formed from a participle *Hiph'il*; (i) ground-form *māqtāl*, as מִלְבִּישׁ *a garment*.

Rem. On מ as preformative of the participles of all the conjugations except *m* *Qal* and *Niph'al*, cf. § 52 c. Many of these participles have become substantives, as מְפִמֶּרֶת *snuffers*, מִשְׁחִית *destroyer, destruction*.

49. Nouns with נ prefixed. Besides the participles *Niph'al* (ground-form *n* *nāqtāl*, still retained e.g. in נֹלַד for *nāwlad*, but commonly attenuated to *nīqtāl*, Hebr. נִקְטָל) and the infinitive *Niph'al* of the form נִקְטַל, the prefix נ is found in נִפְתָּלִים *wrestlings*, Gn 30⁸, which is also to be referred to *Niph'al*, and נִייד *boiled pottage* (stem יויד).

50. With ש prefixed, e.g. שִׁלְהָבֶת *a flame*. On this *Šaph'el* formation, cf. § 55 i. *O*

51. Nouns with ת prefixed. Examples of this formation are numerous, *p* especially from weak stems, for the purpose of strengthening them phonetically (see Barth, *ibid.*, p. 283), and notably from verbs פָּוַשׁ and פָּוַע. They may be classified as follows:—(a) the ground-form *tāqtāl* in תִּהְמָם *ostrich* (?); from verbs פָּוַשׁ, תוֹשֵׁב *a settler*; fem. תוֹחֵלֶת *expectation*, (from the *Hiph'il* תוֹכֵחַ) *correction*; from a verb פָּוַע, תִּימֹן *the south*; from verbs פָּוַע and פָּוַע, תְּוֹרָה *thanksgiving*, and תוֹרָה *law*, both from *Hiph'il*; from a verb פָּוַע and פָּוַע, תְּוֹרָה *issues*; probably belonging to this class, from verbs עָע, תְּבִלָּה *confusion*, and תִּמָּם *a melting away* (developed from תְּבִלָּה and תִּמָּם, from בָּלַל and מָסַם).

(b) *Tiqtāl*, e.g. fem. תְּפָאֶרֶת and תְּפָאֶרֶת *glory*; from a verb פָּוַע, e.g. תְּקוּהָה *hope*; (c) *tāqtāl*, e.g. תְּשַׁבֵּץ *chequer work*; fem. תְּרִדָּה *deep sleep* (probably from the *Niph'al* תְּרִידָה); from a verb פָּוַע, תְּוֹכֵחָה *correction* (from the *Hiph'il*-stem, like the constr. st. plur. תוֹלְדוֹת *generations*); from verbs עָע, תְּהִלָּה *praise*, תְּפִלָּה *prayer* (from the *Pi'el* of the stems הִלַּל and פָּלַל).

- r* With a long vowel in the second syllable: (*d*) *tāqāl*, as תְּהוֹם *the ocean*, the deep (for *tihām*; in Assyrian the fem. *tiāmtu*, constr. st. *tiāmat*, is the usual word for sea), unless it is to be derived with Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p. 113, from the stem תהם; (*e*) *tāqāl* (in Arabic the usual form of the infinitive of conjugation II. which corresponds to the Hebrew *Pi'el*), e.g. from a verb לָה, fem. תְּכָלִית completeness; מְרִבִּית increase, usury, with a parallel form מְרִבִּית in a passive sense, תַּלְמִיד a disciple; (*f*) תַּקְטִיל, e.g. תַּפְּחִי an apple (for *tānpū^{ah}*); very frequently used to form abstracts, e.g. תַּנְמוּל a benefit (also תְּנוּל); from verbs עָרַד a treading down, תְּנוּפָה a waving (like תְּרוּמָה a lifting up, from the *Hiph'el* stem), תְּשׁוּקָה a longing, &c.; very frequently also as an abstract plural, e.g. תַּתְּפֹכֶת perverseness, תַּתְּחַבְּלוֹת guidance, תַּמְרוּרִים bitterness, תַּנְחוּמִים and תַּנְחֻמוֹת consolation; from a verb עָוָה, תַּאֲנִים toil.

XI. Nouns with Affirmatives.

- s* 52. Nouns with ל affixed. Perhaps חֲשָׁמֶל *amber* (?), and probably בְּרוֹן iron, בְּרָמֶל garden-land (*S^{eghōl}* in both cases is probably a modification of the original *ā* in the tone-syllable), בְּעֵל bloom, cf. § 30 q.—According to Prätorius, *ZDMG.* 1903, p. 530 ff., *al* is an affix of endearment in the proper names מִיכָל, חֲמוּטַל (*little lizard* ?) אֲבִיגַיִל (also אֲבִיגַיִל).
- t* 53. Nouns with ם affixed. With an original *ām* as affirmative, אֹלֶם vestibule (although the *ā* in the sing. remains unchangeable), plur. אֱלָמִים; but in כְּנָם a swarm of gnats, the ם is radical. With original affirmative *ām*, עִירָם (also עִירָם) naked (from עוּר, plur. עִירָמִים Gn 3⁷, parallel form עִירָם, plur. עִירָמִים Gn 2²⁵).—To this class also belong the adverbs in *ām* and *ōm*, mentioned in § 100 g, and many proper names, as גִּרְשָׁם, also גִּרְשֹׁם, and גִּרְשֹׁן (*patronymic* גִּרְשֹׁנִי מִלְכָּם, עֶמֶר, &c.; but for פְּדִיּוֹם ransom (?), Nu 3⁴⁹, probably פְּדִיּוֹם is to be read.
- u* 54. Nouns with ך affixed. The ך is added by means of a simple helping vowel in כְּנָעַן *Canaan*, and צַפִּיָּן a finger nail; more frequently the addition is made by means of a tone-bearing *ā*, which in Hebrew is modified to *S^{eghōl}* (as גִּרְוֹן *axe*) or lengthened to *ā* (but cf. also אֲחִירָתִית and קִרְרִית); e.g. קִנְיָן a possession, שִׁלְחָן a table, קָרְבַּן an offering. From an original *ā* being changed into an obscure *ō* we may probably explain such forms as דָּאָבֹן a pining away; דָּרְבֹן (also דָּרְבֹן) a goad; רָעִבֹן hunger; from verbs לָה, גָּאוֹן pride, הָמוֹן noise, חוֹזֹן a vision; שָׂרִיוֹן a coat of mail; from a verb מָשָׂאֹן, מָשָׂאֹן guile (the only instance with both *o* preformative and *ōn* affirmative)¹; very frequently from the simple stem with an unorganic sharpening of the second radical, e.g. בְּלִיּוֹן memorial, בְּלִיּוֹן destruction (constr. st. וְבִלְיוֹן and בְּלִיּוֹן, &c.; cf. also הֵרִיוֹן pregnancy (for הֵרָה) and § 93 *uu*); קִיָּקְלוֹן shame, for קִלְקָלוֹן. Proper names occur with the termination *ūn*, as יִשְׂרָוִן, § 86 g, and others.

¹ The plurals נִצְנִים flowers, Ct 2¹², and קִמְשָׁנִים thorns appear to be formed directly from the singulars נִץ (cf. נִצָּה) and קִמּוּשׁ with the insertion of *ān* (which in קִמּוּ is obscured to *ōn*). See Nöldeke, *Mand. Gr.*, p. 169, Rem. 3; similarly, according to Hoffmann, 'Einige phöniz. Inschriften,' p. 15 (*Abh. der Gött. Ges. der Wiss.*, xxxvi), עֲוֹבִים wares, Ez 27^{14,16} from עֹב = עָצַב.

Rem. A large number of proper names now ending in ה־ or י־ used to *U* be classed as nouns originally formed with the affix ה־. The subsequent rejection of the final *Nûn* seemed to be confirmed by the form מְגִדוֹן, once used (Zc 12¹¹) for מְגִדוֹן (and conversely in Pr 27²⁰ *Kethibh* אֲבִדָה, *Qere* אֲבִדוֹן for אֲבִדוֹן *destruction*), also by the fact that for שְׁלֹמֹה the LXX give the form Σολωμών or Σαλωμών, and especially that in patronymics and tribal names (§ 86 h) a *Nûn* appears before the termination י, as גִּלְיָנִי *Gilonite* from גִּלְיָה and נִשְׁיָלָנִי from נִשְׁיָלָה (modern name *Sailûn*). Wetzstein, however (in *Delitzsch's Commentary on Job*, 1st ed., p. 599), explained the *Nûn* in מְגִדוֹן as a secondary addition to the common old-Palestinian termination ה (יִרְחֹוּ, עֲבֹוּ, רְמוֹנוֹ, &c.), and Barth (*Nominalbildung*, § 224 b) has since shown the unsoundness of the prevailing view on other grounds: the rejection of the *Nûn* would be much more likely to occur in the numerous appellatives in ה־ than in proper names, and גִּלְיָנִי and נִשְׁיָלָנִי are due to the necessity of avoiding, for euphonic reasons, such forms as *gîlô-î*, *šîlô-î*, &c.; cf. also נִשְׁלָנִי from נִשְׁלָה.

On the affirmatives י־, י־, י־, י־, י־, see below, § 86 h-l.

XII. Quadriliterals and Quinqueliterals.

55. בָּלְמוֹד *barren*, חֶלְמִישׁ *a flint*, and the fem זֶלְעָפָה *heat*, &c., have probably *W* arisen from the insertion of a ל; חֶרְגֹל *a locust*, כְּרֹדֶם *an axe*, כֶּרְעָפָה *a branch*, Ez 31⁶ (verses 6, 8 כֶּרְעָפָה, שְׁעָרֵי, שְׁעָרֵי) *anxious thoughts*, שִׁרְפִיט *sceptre*, from insertion of a ר, which is common in Aramaic. Cf., moreover, חֶרְמִשׁ *a sickle*, סִמְדָר *vine-blossom*; with an initial ע, עֵטְלָף *a bat*, עֶקְבִּישׁ *a spider*, עֶקְבָר *a mouse*, עֶקְרָב *a scorpion*,¹ &c.—Quinqueliteral, צִפְרִדָּע *a frog*.

§ 86. Denominative Nouns.

1. Such are all nouns formed *immediately* from another noun, *a* whether the latter be primitive or derived from a verb, e.g. קִדְמוֹן *eastern*, immediately from קָדַם *the east* (verbal stem קָדַם *to be in front*).

2. Most of the forms which nouns of this class assume have already *b* been given in §§ 84 and 85, since the denominatives, as secondary (although in some cases very old) forms, invariably follow the analogy of the verbal derivatives. As, for instance, the verbals with a prefixed מ (§ 85 e to m) express the place, &c., of an action, so the denominatives with מ *local* represent the place where a thing is found or its neighbourhood (see e).

The most common forms of denominatives are—

1. Those like the *participle* Qal (§ 84^a s), e.g. שְׁעָרִי *a porter*, from שָׁעַר *a gate*; בָּקָר *a herdsman*, from בָּקָר *a herd*; פָּרֵם *a vinedresser*, from פָּרַם *a vineyard*.

2. Those like the form *qāṭṭāl* (§ 84^b b), e.g. קִשֶּׁת *an archer*, from קִשֶּׁת *a bow*. *d*

¹ Derenbourg (*REJ.*, 1883, p. 165) infers from the above examples and a comparison of the Arabic *'uṣṣūr*, *sparrow* (from *ṣafara*, *to chirp*), that ע was especially employed to form quadriliteral names of animals.

Both these forms (c and d) indicate customary occupations, inhering in the subject, like Greek nouns in *της, τεύς*, e. g. *πολίτης, γραμματεύς*.

e 3. Nouns with מ prefixed, denoting the place where a thing is (cf. § 85 e), or its neighbourhood, e. g. מַעֵין *a place of fountains*, from עֵין; מַרְגְּלוֹת *the place about the feet*, מַרְאֲשׁוֹת *the place about the head*, from רֶגֶל; מִקְשָׁה; ראשׁ, רֶגֶל (for מִקְשָׁה) *a cucumber field*, from קֶשֶׂא cucumber. Cf. ἀμπελῶν from ἀμπελος.

f 4. Nouns with the termination יָ or ון expressing adjectival ideas: קְדָמוֹן eastern, from קָדָם; אַחֲרוֹן posterior, from אַחֵר; חִיצוֹן exterior, from חוּץ; probably also לוֹיִתָּן coiled, hence coiled animal, serpent, from לֹוּיָהּ a winding; נְחֹשֶׁתִּין brazen, from נְחֹשֶׁת brass. Also abstracts, e. g. עֵוְרוֹן blindness, from עוּר. Cf. § 85 u.—With a double termination (ōn or ān with i) אֲדָמִי reddish, יָדְעָנִי a knowing (spirit); צַפְעָנִי basilisk; רַחֲמָנִיּוֹת merciful [fem. plur.].

g ון appears to be used as a diminutive ending (cf. the Syriac ון) in אִישׁוֹן little man (in the eye), אֵפוֹן apple of the eye, from אֵישׁ¹; on the other hand נִשְׁפִּיפִן adder, which was formerly regarded as a diminutive, is properly an adjectival form from שָׁפַף to rub (hence, as it were, a rubbing creature); in the same way יִשְׂרָאוֹן is a denominative from יָשׁוּר (= יֵשֶׁר), properly upright (righteous people), and not a diminutive (pious little people, and the like); finally שְׁהָרוֹן is not lunula, but an artificial moon (used as an ornament), and צַוְרָנִים not little neck, but necklace (from צָוָר neck). Cf. Delitzsch on Ct 4⁹.

h 5. Peculiar to denominatives is the termination יָ, which converts a substantive into an adjective, and is added especially to numerals and names of persons and countries, in order to form ordinals, patronymics, and tribal names; e. g. רַגְלִי footman, plur. רַגְלִים, from רֶגֶל foot; אֲכֹרִי cruel, נָכְרִי strange, from נָכַר strangeness, תַּחְתִּי lower, from תַּחַת below, fem. תַּחְתִּיָּה and תַּחְתִּיָּה, plur. תַּחְתִּיָּים, תַּחְתִּיָּוִת, תַּחְתִּיָּוִת; שִׁשִּׁי the sixth, from שֵׁשׁ six; מוֹאבִּי Moabite, from מוֹאָב, plur. מוֹאבִּים, fem. מוֹאבִּיָּה and מוֹאבִּיָּת, plur. מוֹאבִּיָּוִת; עִבְרִי Hebrew, plur. עִבְרִים, fem. עִבְרִיָּה, plur. עִבְרִיָּוִת; יִשְׂרָאֵלִי Israelite, from יִשְׂרָאֵל. When the original substantive is a compound, it is resolved again into two words, e. g. בְּנֵימִי Benjamite, from בְּנִימִין (cf. on the use of the article in such cases, § 127 d).

i Instead of יָ we find in a few cases (a) the ending יָ (as in Aram.), e. g. כִּילִי (crafty, or, according to others, churlish) if it stands for כִּילִי and is not rather from a stem כִּלָּה or כִּלָּה; חוּרִי white cloth, Is 19⁸ in pause; perhaps also צְבִי a swarm of locusts, Am 7¹ (צְבִי Na 3¹⁷); hardly נְגִינוֹתִי Is 38²⁰, Hb 3¹⁹; but certainly in proper names as בְּרִזְלִי (ferreus) Barzillai;² and (b) הָ,

[¹ Cf. Barth, § 212; König, ii. 1, 413. Diminutives in Semitic languages are, however, most commonly formed by inserting a y after the second radical, e. g. Aram. עוּלִימָא, Syr. حَكَمَلَا, Arab. غُلَامٌ a very young man, kulāib, a little dog, &c. Since Olshausen (§ 180), וְעִיר a little (Is 28^{10.13}, Jb 36²) has commonly been regarded as an example of the same form, to which others have added שְׁבִיטִים Is 3¹⁸ (as though a foreign dialectical form for šumais, little sun), and אֲמִינוֹן 2 S 13²⁰, as a contemptuous diminutive form of אֲמִנוֹן; cf. Ewald, § 167, W. Wright, Arab. Gramm.² i. § 269, De Lagarde, Nominalbildung, pp. 85–87, König, ii. 1, p. 143 f. The existence of the form in Hebrew is disputed by Barth, § 192 d.]

² On יָ as an old fem. ending, see above, § 80 l.

arising from *ay*, in אֵשָׁה belonging to fire (אֵשׁ), i. e. a sacrifice offered by fire; לְבֵנָה (prop. milky) the storax-shrub, Arabic lubnay.

6. Abstract nouns formed from concretes by the addition of וֹת, [יָה, ה] k (§ 95 t), cf. our terminations -dom, -hood, -ness, e.g. יְלֻדוֹת youth, מְלָכּוֹת kingdom (the omission of the Dageš in כ shows that the *Šwā* is weakened from a full vowel; on *malik* as underlying the present form מַלְכֶּךָ cf. § 84^a a); אֶלְמָנוֹת widowhood, from אֶלְמָן widower, אֶלְמָנָה widow. In Aram. this fem. ending וֹת (or וּ with rejection of the ת) is a common termination of the infinitive in the derived conjugations (cf., as substantival infinitives of this kind, הַשְׁמָעוֹת the announcing, Ez 24²⁶, and הַתְּחַבְּרוֹת the making of a league, Dn 11²⁸); in Hebr. וֹת as a termination to express abstract ideas (including some which appear to be directly derived from the verbal stem, as סְכָלוֹת folly, רְפָאוֹת a healing¹) becomes more common only in the later books. It is affixed to adjectives ending in י (see above, h) in אֲבִירוֹת cruelty, and קוֹמָמִיּוֹת upright position (Lv 26¹³, used adverbially).

The ending יָה is found earlier, e.g. in שְׂאֵרִית remainder, רֵאשִׁית prin-
cipium, from רֹאשׁ=ראש (head) princeps. The termination *ôth* seems to occur in חֲכָמוֹת wisdom (in Pr 1²⁰, 9¹, joined to a singular; so also חֲכָמוֹת Pr 14¹, where, probably, חֲכָמוֹת should likewise be read) and in הוֹלָלוֹת Ec 1¹⁷, &c., with the parallel form הוֹלִלּוֹת Ec 10¹³.

§ 87. Of the Plural.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 426 ff., and on the feminines, p. 441 ff.; M. Lambert, 'Remarques sur la formation du pluriel hébreu,' *REJ.* xxiv. 99 ff., and 'Les anomalies du pluriel des noms en Hébreu,' *REJ.* xliii. 206 ff.; P. Lajčiak, *Die Plural- u. Dualendungen im semit. Nomen*, Lpz. 1903; J. Barth, 'Beiträge zur Pluralbildung des Semit.,' *ZDMG.* 1904, p. 431 ff., i. 'the *ai* of the constr. st.'

1. The regular plural termination for the masculine gender is יָם, a always with the tone, e.g. סוּס horse, plur. סוּסִים horses; but also very often written defectively יָם, especially when in the same word one of the vowel letters, ו or י, precedes, e.g. גִּנּוּיִם. Nouns in יָה make their plural in יָם, e.g. עֵבְרִי a Hebrew, plur. עֵבְרִיִּים (Ex 3¹⁸); but usually contraction takes place, e.g. עֵבְרִים; שָׁנִים crimson garments, from שָׁנִי.

Nouns in הָה lose this termination when they take the plural הָה ending, e.g. הָה seer, plur. הָהִים (cf. § 75 h).—In regard to the loss of the tone from the הָה in the two old plurals מַיִם water and שָׁמַיִם heaven, cf. § 88 d and § 96.

The termination יָם is sometimes assumed also by feminines (cf. c שָׁנִים women, § 96 under אֵשָׁה; שָׁנִים years, from שָׁנָה; שָׁנִים ewes, from שָׁנָה), so that an indication of gender is not necessarily implied in it (cf. also below, m-p).—On the use of this termination יָם to express abstract, extensive, and intensive ideas, cf. § 124.

¹ [See a complete list of instances in König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 1, p. 205 f.]

d The ending *im* is also common in Phoenician, e. g. צִדְנִים *Sidonii*; Assyrian has *āni* (acc. to P. Haupt originally *āmi*, cf. § 88 *d*); Aramaic has *in*; Arabic *ūna* (nominative) and *ina* (in the oblique cases, but in vulgar Arabic *in* is also used for the nominative); Ethiopic *ān*. Cf. also the verbal ending *in* in the 3rd plur. perf. (§ 44 *l*) and in the 3rd and 2nd plur. impf. (§ 47 *m*).¹

e Less frequent, or only apparent terminations of the plur. masc. are—

(a) יָ, as in Aramaic,² found almost exclusively in the later books of the O. T. (apart from the poetical use in some of the older and even the oldest portions), viz. מְלָכִין *kings*, Pr 31³, אֲדָרָתִין 1 K 11³³, רָצִין *the guard*, 2 K 11¹³, חֲטָיִן *wheat*, Ez 4⁹; defectively אֲנִין *islands*, Ez 26¹⁸; יָמִין *days*, Dn 12¹³. Cf. also מְדִינִין *carpets*, Ju 5¹⁰, in the North-Palestinian song of Deborah, which also has other linguistic peculiarities; עֵינִין *heaps*, Mi 3¹² (before ת; cf. § 44 *k*); מְלָלִין *words* (from the really Aram. מְלָלָה, Jb 4², and twelve other places in Job (beside מְלָלִים, ten times in Job); further, חֲטָיִן Jb 24²², אֲחֵרִין 31¹⁰, and שׁוּמֵמִין La 1⁴, חֲטָיִן 4³.—The following forms are doubtful:

f (b) יָ (with the *ā* rejected, as, according to some, in the dual יָדִים for יָדַיִם Ez 13¹⁸, cf. § 88 *c*), e. g. מְכִי *stringed instruments*, ψ 45⁹ for מְכִיִּים (unless it is to be so written)³; עַמִּי *peoples*, ψ 144², and, probably, also La 3¹⁴ (in 2 S 22⁴⁴ it may be taken as עַמִּי *my people*; cf. in the parallel passage ψ 184⁴ עַם; also in Ct 8² the *i* of רַמְּנִי is better regarded as a *suffix*); see also 2 S 23⁸ as compared with 1 Ch 11¹¹, and on the whole question Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 524 ff. More doubtful still is—

g (c) יָ (like the constr. state in Syriac), which is supposed to appear in e. g. שָׂרֵי *princes*, Ju 5¹⁵ (perhaps *my princes* is intended: read either the constr. st. שָׂרֵי, which also has good authority, or with LXX שָׂרִים); for חֲלוּנֵי וס' Jer 22¹⁴ (according to others *dual*, see § 88 *c*, or a loan word, cf. ZA. iii. 93) read חֲלוּנֵי סָפֹן. On גֻּבֵּי and חֹרֵי, which have also been so explained, see above, § 86 *i*.—חֲשׂוּפֵי Is 20⁴ (where the right reading is certainly חֲשׂוּפֵי) must be intended by the Masora either as a singular with the formative syllable יָ = *bareness* or, more probably, as a constr. st. with the original termination *ay* (cf. § 89 *d*) to avoid the harsh combination *h^asūfē šēl⁴*; in אֲדֹנֵי *the Lord* (prop. *my lord*, from the plur. *majestatis*, אֲדֹנִים *lord*, the *ay* was originally a *suffix*, § 135 *q*).

h (d) סָפֹן a supposed *plural* ending in בָּנִים = בָּנִים *gnats* (or *lice*), and סֵלֶם *ladder* (supposed by some to be a plur. like our *stairs*); but cf. on the former, § 85 *t*.

i 2. The plural termination of the *feminine gender* is generally indicated by the termination וֹת (often written defectively תֹּת —, e. g. תְּהִלָּה *song of praise, psalm*, plur. תְּהִלוֹת (only in post-biblical Hebrew

¹ On the connexion between all these endings see Dietrich's *Abhandl. zur hebr. Gramm.*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 51 ff.; Halévy, *REJ.* 1888, p. 138 ff. [cf. also Driver, *Tenses*, § 6, Obs. 2].

² So also always in the Meša' inscription, e. g. line 2 שלשן *thirty*; line 4 מלכין *kings*; line 5 ימן רבן *many days, &c.*

³ According to some this *i* is simply due to a neglect of the point (§ 5 *m*), which in MSS. and elsewhere marked the abbreviation of the plur. ending.

⁴ Prätorius, *ZDMG.* 1903, p. 525, regards חֲשׂוּפֵי as an instance of the affix of endearment (cf. בְּלוּבִי, אֲחֻמִּי) transferred to an appellative, but such an explanation is rendered unlikely by the meaning of this isolated instance.

סֵפֶר תְּהִלֹּת, as in the headings of the printed editions, as well as סֵפֶר תְּהִלֹּת *the Book of Psalms*); אֵלֶּת *a letter*, plur. אֵלֶּת; בְּאֵר *a well*, plur. בְּאֵרוֹת. Feminines in יָת־ form their plural in יָתֹת, e.g. מִצְרִית *an Egyptian woman*, plur. מִצְרִיֹּת; and those in וֹת either make יָתֹת, as מַלְכוּת *kingdom*, plur. מַלְכוּתֹת, Dn 8²² (cf. חֲנוּיֹת *cells*, Jer 37¹⁶), or are inflected like עֲדוּת *testimonies* (pronounced 'edh^ewôth for 'edhûwôth).

It is only from a mistake or disregard of these feminine endings וֹת and יָתֹת that some words ending with them form their plural by the addition of יָם or וֹת, e.g. חֲנִית *spear*, plur. חֲנִיתִים and חֲנִיתוֹת; וְנוֹת *whoredom*, plur. וְנוֹתִים (by the side of וְנוֹתִים); אֶלְמְנוּתִים *widowhood*; נְשִׁיתוֹת *pits*, plur. נְשִׁיתֹת (if connected with Assy. *kâsu*, to bind), &c.

The termination -ôth stands primarily for -âth (which is the form it has in Arab., Eth., in the *constr. st.* of Western Aramaic, in Eastern Syriac, and also in Assyrian; on the change of â into an obscure ô, see § 9 q). On the other hand, it is doubtful whether this âth is to be regarded as a lengthened and stronger form of the singular fem. ending âth (cf. § 80 b).

How the changeable vowels of a noun are shortened or become *šewâ* in consequence of the addition of the plural endings is explained in §§ 92-5.

3. Words which in the singular are used both as masculine and ^mfeminine (§ 122 d), often have in the plural parallel forms with the masculine and feminine terminations, e.g. עָב *cloud*, plur. עָבִים and עָבוֹת; and each form may be treated either as masculine or feminine, according to the usage of the particular word.—But even those words, of which the gender is invariable, sometimes have both plural forms, e.g. דּוֹר masc. *a generation*, plur. דּוֹרִים and דּוֹרוֹת; שָׁנָה fem. *a year*, plur. שָׁנִים and שָׁנוֹת (see the Rem.). In these words the gender of both plural forms remains the same as in the singular, e.g. אֲרִי masc. *a lion*, plur. אֲרִיֹּת masc., Zp 3³, דּוֹרוֹת masc., Jb 42¹⁶.

Sometimes usage makes a distinction between the two plural forms of the *n* same word. Thus, יָמִים *days*, שָׁנִים *years* are the usual, but יָמוֹת (only twice, in the *constr. st.* Dt 32⁷, 90¹⁵) and שָׁנוֹת (also only in the *constr. st.* and before suffixes) are rarer poetic forms.

A difference of meaning appears in several names of members of the body, *o* the dual (see § 88) denoting the living members themselves, while the plur. in וֹת expresses something like them, but without life (§ 122 u), e.g. יָדַי *hands*, יָדוֹת *artificial hands*, also e.g. the arms of a throne; כַּפָּי *hands*, כַּפּוֹת *handles* (Lat. *manubria*); פֶּעַם *foot*, פֶּעַמוֹת *artificial feet* (of the ark); קַרְנִים *horns*, קַרְנוֹת *horns* (of the altar); עֵינַי *eyes*, עֵינֹת *fountains*; cf. also אֲרִיִּים *lions*, אֲרִיֹּת *the figures of lions* on Solomon's throne, תָּמָר *palm*, תְּמָרָה *a palm-like column*, plur. תְּמָרִים and תְּמָרוֹת.

4. A considerable number of masculines form their plural in וֹת, *p* while many feminines have a plural in יָם. The gender of the singular, however, is as a rule retained in the plural.

Undoubted instances of masculines with (masculine) plural in **ות** are : **אב** *father*, **אוצר** *treasure*, **באר** and **בור** *cistern*, **זנב** *tail*, **חלום** *dream*, **כפא** *throne*, **לב** and **לבב** *heart*, **לוח** *tablet*, **ליל** and **לילה** *night*, **מזבח** *altar*, **מקום** *place*, **נאר** *skin-bottle*, **נר** *lamp*, **עור** *skin*, **קול** *voice*, **שולחן** *table*, **שם** *name*, **שופר** *trumpet*.

q Feminines ending in **ה** which take in the plural the termination **ים** are **אלה** *terebinth*, **אימה** *terror* (but also **אימות**), **דבילה** *a cake of figs*, **חטה** *wheat*, **לבנה** *a brick*, **מלה** (only in poetry) *a word*, **סאה** *seā, a dry measure*, **שעורה** *barley*, and the following names of animals **דבורה** *a bee* and **יונה** *a dove*; also, for **ביצים** *fem. eggs*, a singular **ביצה** is to be assumed. **אלמה** *sheaf* and **שנה** *year* (see above, n) take both **ים** and **ות**; cf. finally **שבלת** *an ear of corn*, plur. **שבלים**, and without the fem. termination in the singular **פילגיש** *concubine*, plur. **פילגשים**.

r 5. A strict distinction in gender between the two plural endings is found, in fact, only in adjectives and participles, e.g. **טובים** *boni*, **טובות** *bonae*, **קטלים** *masc.*, **קטלות** *fem.* So also in substantives of the same stem, where there is an express distinction of sex, as **בנים** *filiī*, **בנות** *filiae*; **מלכים** *reges*, **מלכות** *reginae*.

s Rem. 1. In some few words there is added to the plural ending **ות** a second (masculine) plural termination (in the form of the constr. *st.* **ים**, cf. § 89 c), or a dual ending **ים**, e.g. **במה** *a high place*, plur. **במות**, constr. *st.* **במותי** (also **במת** *bāmōthē*, Is 14¹⁴, Jb 9⁸, &c., sometimes as *Q^{erē}* to the *K^{ethibh}* **במותי**; see § 95 o); **מראשתי שאול** *from Saul's head*, 1 S 26¹²; **חומה** *wall*, plur. **חומות** *moenia*, whence dual **חומתים** *double walls*. This double indication of the plural appears also in the connexion of suffixes with the plural ending **ות** (§ 91 m).

t 2. Some nouns are only used in the singular (e.g. **אדם** *man*, and collectively *men*); a number of other nouns only in the plural, e.g. **מתים** *men* (the old *sing.* **מתו** is only preserved in proper names, see § 90 o; in Eth. the *sing.* is *mēt*, *man*); some of these have, moreover, a singular meaning (§ 124 a), as **פנים** *face*. In such cases, however, the same form can also express plurality, e.g. **פנים** means also *faces*, Gn 40⁷, Ez 1⁶; cf. **אלהים** *God*, and also *gods* (the *sing.* **אלה**, a later formation from it, occurs only ten times, except in Job forty-one and in Daniel four times).

§ 88. Of the Dual.

Cf. the literature on the Semitic dual in Grünert, *Die Begriffs-Präponderanz und die Duale a potiori im Altarab.* (Wien, 1886), p. 21; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 455 ff.

a 1. The *dual* is a further indication of number, which originated in early times. In Hebrew, however, it is almost exclusively used to denote those objects which naturally occur in pairs (see e). The dual termination is never found in adjectives, verbs, or pronouns. In the noun it is indicated in both genders by the termination **ים**.

appended to the ground-form,¹ e.g. יָדַיְם *both hands*, יוֹמַיְם *two days*. In the feminine the dual termination is always added to the old ending *ath* (instead of תָּ), but necessarily with *ā* (since it is in an open syllable before the tone), thus תָּיְם, e.g. שְׂפָתַיְם *both lips*. From a feminine with the ending תָּ, e.g. נְהַשְׁתָּ (from *nēhušt*) the dual is formed like נְהַשְׁתָּיְם *double fetters*.

With nouns which in the singular have not a feminine ending, the *b* dual termination is likewise really added to the ground-form; but the latter generally undergoes certain changes in consequence of the shifting of the tone, e.g. כְּנָף *wing* (ground-form *kānāph*), dual כְּנָפַיְם, the first *ā* becoming *Šewā*, since it no longer stands before the tone, and the second *ā* being lengthened before the new tone-syllable. In 1 K 16²⁴, 2 K 5^{23b} the form כְּנָפַיְם (which should be כְּנָפַיְם) evidently merely points to the *constr. st.* כְּנָפִי, which would be expected before פָּסֶף; cf. כְּנָפַיְם in 2 K 5^{23a}, and on the syntax see § 131 *d*. In the segholate forms (§ 84^a *a*) the dual ending is mostly added to the ground-form, e.g. רַגְלַיְם *foot* (ground-form *rāgl*), dual רַגְלַיְם; cf., however, קַרְנַיְם (only in the book of Daniel), as well as קַרְנַיְם from קֶרֶן *horn*, and לְחַיְם from לֶחִי *cheek* (as if from the plurals קַרְנוֹת, לְחָיִם).—A feminine dual of an adjective used substantivally occurs in עֲצֵלָיְם *a sluggish pair* (of hands) Ec 10¹⁸ from the sing. עֲצֵל.

Rem. 1. Certain place-names were formerly reckoned as dual-forms (so in *C* earlier editions of this Grammar, and still in König's *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 437), viz.—(a) those in יְיָ and יְיָ, e.g. דִּתַּיְם Gn 37^{17a} (locative דִּתַּיְם, but in ^{17b} דִּתַּיְם), and דִּתַּיְם 2 K 6¹³; קִרְיַיְם Jos 21³², identical with קִרְיַיְם in 1 Ch 6⁶¹ (cf. also the Moabite names of towns in the Mēša' inscription, line 10 קִרִּית = Hebrew קִרְיַיְם; line 30 דִּבְלַתָּם = בת דִּבְלַתָּם Jer 48²²; lines 31, 32 חֲרוֹנִים = חֲרוֹנִים Is 15⁵, &c.); (b) in מְ, Jos 15³⁴ הָעֵינִים (= עֵינַיְם Gn 38²¹). The view that יְיָ and מְ arise from a contraction of the dual terminations יְיָ (as in Western Aramaic, cf. also nom. *āni*, accus. *aini*, of the dual in Arabic) and מְ seemed to be supported by the Mēša' inscription, where we find (line 20) מֵאָתַיְם = מֵאָתַיְם, Hebrew מֵאָתַיְם. But in many of these supposed duals either a dual sense cannot be detected at all, or it does not agree at any rate with the nature of the Semitic dual, as found elsewhere. Hence it can hardly be doubted that יְיָ and מְ in these place-names only arise from a subsequent expansion of the terminations יְיָ and מְ: so Wellhausen, *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, xxi. 433; Philippi, *ZDMG*. xxxii. 65 f.; Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 319, note 5; Strack, *Kommentar zur Genesis*, p. 135. The strongest argument in favour of this opinion is that we have a clear case of such an expansion in the *Q'rē perpetuum* (§ 17 *c*) יְרוּשָׁלַיְם for יְרוּשָׁלַם (so, according to Strack, even in old MSS. of the Mišna; cf. *Urusalim* in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and the Aramaic form יְרוּשָׁלַם): similarly in

¹ On dual endings appended to the plural see § 87 *s* and § 95 *o* at the beginning.

the Aramaic שְׁמָרֹן = שְׁמֶרֶן for the Hebrew שְׁמֶרֶן *Samaria*.—We may add to this list אֶפְרַיִם, נַחֲרָיִם the river country (in the Tel-el-Amarna letters *nārīma*, *na'rīma*), מִצְרַיִם *Egypt*, Phoenician מצרם; also the words denoting time, צַהֲרָיִם *midday* (Mêšā' inscription, line 15 צהרם), and perhaps עֶרְבָיִם in the evening, if the regular expression בֵּין הָעֶרְבָיִם Ex 12⁶, 16¹², &c., is only due to mistaking עֶרְבָיִם for a dual: LXX πρὸς ἑσπέραν, τὸ δειλινόν, ὀψέ, and only in Lv 23⁵ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν. The Arabs also say *el 'iṣā'an*, the two evenings, cf. Kuhn's *Literaturblatt*, iii. 48.

Instead of the supposed dual יָרֵי Ex 13¹⁸ read יָרִים. On חַלּוּנֵי (generally taken to be a double window) Jer 22¹⁴, see above, § 87 g.

d 2. Only apparently dual-forms (but really plural) are the words מַיִם *water* and שָׁמַיִם *heaven*. According to P. Haupt in *SBOT*. (critical notes on Isaiah, p. 157, line 18 ff.), they are to be derived from the old plural forms (found in Assyrian) *māmi*, *šamāmi*, whence the Hebr. מַיִם, שָׁמַיִם arose by inversion of the *i*, *māmi*, *māmi*, *maim*. It is simpler, however, to suppose that the primitive singulars *may* and *šamay*, when they took the plural of extension (§ 124 b), kept the tone on the *ay*, thus causing the *im* (which otherwise always has the tone, § 87 a) to be shortened to *im*. Cf. the analogous formations, Arab. *tarḡaina*, 2nd fem. sing. imperf. of a verb *لَوى*, for *tarḡay + ina*, corresponding to *taḡtulīna* in the strong verb; also bibl.-Aram. בָּרְנָן the abs. st. plur. of the p'cp. *Qal* of בָּנָה (*לִי*), which otherwise always ends in *in* with the tone, e.g. in the p'cp. *Qal* of the strong verb, דָּבַחֵן *sacrificing*.

e 2. The use of the dual in Hebrew is confined, except in the numerals 2, 12, 200, &c. (see § 97), practically to those objects which are by nature or art always found in *pairs*, especially to the double members of the body (but not necessarily so, cf. יָדַיִם and זְרַעוֹת *arms*, never in the dual), e.g. יָדַיִם *both hands*, אָזְנוֹיִם *both ears*, שִׁנָּיִם *teeth* (of both rows), also נַעֲלָיִם *a pair of sandals*, מֵאֲזֵנִים *a pair of scales*, Lat. *bilanx*, &c.; or things which are at least thought of as forming a pair, e.g. יוֹמִים *two* (successive) *days*, Lat. *biduum*; שָׁבָעִים *two weeks*; שְׁנָתַיִם *two years* (in succession), Lat. *biennium*; אַמָּתַיִם *two cubits*.¹

f In the former case the dual may be used for a plural, either indefinite or defined by a numeral, where it is thought of in a double arrangement, e.g. אַרְבַּע רַגְלִים *four feet*, Lv 11²³; שֵׁשׁ כְּנָפַיִם *six wings* (i.e. three pairs), Is 6², Ez 1⁶; even שִׁבְעָה עֵינָיִם *seven eyes*, Zc 3⁹, כָּל-בִּרְפָּיִם *all knees*, Ez 7¹⁷; כָּל-יָדַיִם *all hands*, Ez 21¹²; מִצְלָתַיִם *cymbals*, Ezr 3¹⁰; שְׁפָתַיִם *double-hooks*, Ez 40⁴³.—To express a certain emphasis the numeral *two* is used with the dual, as in Ju 16²⁸, Am 3¹².—See some other remarks on the use of the dual in § 87 o and s.

g It is not impossible that Hebrew at an earlier period made a more extensive and freer use of the dual, and that the restrictions and limitations of its use, mentioned above, belong to a relatively later phase of development. The

¹ But for דְּרָכַיִם Pr 28^{6,18} (which the Masora takes as two roads leading from the cross-ways) דְּרָכַיִם is to be read.

b Very frequently such interdependent words are also united by *Maqqeph* (§ 16 a); this, however, is not necessary, but depends on the accentuation in the particular case. On the wider uses of the *constr. st.* see the Syntax, § 130.

c 2. The *vowel* changes which are occasioned in many nouns by the *construct state* are more fully described in §§ 92-5. But besides these, the *terminations* of the noun in the *construct state* sometimes assume a special form. Thus:

(a) In the *construct state*, plural and dual, the termination is '—, e. g. סוסים *horses*, פֶּרָעָה סוסים *the horses of Pharaoh*; עֵינַי, עֵינֶיךָ *the eyes of the king*.

d Rem. The '— of the dual has evidently arisen from '— (cf. יָדַיִם), but the origin of the termination '— in the *constr. st. plur.* is disputed. The Syriac *constr. st.* in *ay* and the form of the plural noun before suffixes (סוסֵיךָ, &c., § 91 h) would point to a contraction of an original '—, as in the dual. But whether this *ay* was only transferred from the dual to the plural (so Olshausen, and Nöldeke, *Beitr. zur sem. Sprachwiss.*, Strassb. 1904, p. 48 ff.), or is to be regarded as the *abstract, collective termination*, as in אֲנָשִׁים (see *f*) and חֲנֹרִי (so Philippi, *ThLZ.* 1890, col. 419; Barth, *ZDMG.* 1904, p. 431 ff.), must be left undecided.

e (b) The original ת— is regularly retained as the feminine termination in the *construct state* sing. of those nouns which in the *absolute state* end in ת—, e. g. מַלְכָּה *queen*, מַלְכַּת שֶׁבַּא *the queen of Sheba*. But the feminine endings ת—, ת—, and also the plural ת—, remain unchanged in the *construct state*.

f (c) Nouns in ת— (cf. § 75 e) from verbs לָהֵא (§ 93, Paradigm III c) form their *constr. st.* in ת—, e. g. רֹאֶה *seer*, constr. רֹאֶה. If this ת— is due to contraction of the original '—, with ה added as a vowel letter, we may compare רִי, constr. רִי *sufficiency*; חַי, constr. חַי *life*; נָיִי, constr. נָיִי *valley*.

On the terminations י and '— in the *constr. st.* see § 90.

§ 90. Real and Supposed Remains of Early Case-endings.

הֶ— *local*, י *in compound proper names*, '— and י *in the Construct State*.

K. U. Nylander, *Om Kasusändelserna i Hebräiskan*, Upsala, 1882; J. Barth, 'Die Casusreste im Hebr.,' *ZDMG.* liii. 593 ff.

a 1. As the Assyrian and old Arabic distinguish three cases by special endings, so also in the Hebrew noun there are three endings which, in the main, correspond to those of the Arabic. It is, however, a question whether they are all to be regarded as real remnants of former case-endings, or are in some instances to be explained other-

wise. It can hardly be doubted (but cf. *h*, Rem.) that the (locative) termination ןֿ is a survival of the old accusative termination *a*, and that יֿ in certain compound proper names is the old sign of the nominative. The explanation of the יֿ as an old genitive sign, which, as being no longer understood in Hebrew, was used for quite different purposes, and the view that יֿ is a form of the nominative termination יֿ , are open to grave doubts.

In Assyrian the rule is that *u* marks the nominative, *i* the genitive, and *a* the accusative,¹ 'in spite of the many and various exceptions to this rule which occur' (Delitzsch, *Assyrische Gram.*, § 66). Similarly, the Arabic case-endings in the fully declined nouns (*Triptotes*) are: *-u* for the nominative, *-i* for the genitive, and *-a* for the accusative; in the *Diptotes* the ending *-a* represents the genitive also. In modern Arabic these endings have almost entirely disappeared, and if they are now and then used, as among the Beduin, it is done without regularity, and one is interchanged with another (Wallin, in *ZDMG.* v, p. 9, xii, p. 874; Wetzstein, *ibid.*, xxii, p. 113 f., and especially Spitta, *Gramm. des arab. Vulgärdialekts von Ägypten*, Lpz. 1880, p. 147 ff.). Even as early as the Sinaitic inscriptions, their regular use is not maintained (Beer, *Studia Asiatica*, iii. 1840, p. xviii; Tuch, *ZDMG.* iii. 139 f.). Ethiopic has preserved only the *-a* (in proper names *-há*), which is, however, still used for the whole range of the accusative, and also (the distinction of case being lost) as a termination of the *constr. st.* to connect it with a following genitive.

2. As remarked above, under *a*, the accusative form is preserved ^c in Hebrew most certainly and clearly in the (usually toneless) ending ןֿ , originally *ā*, as in the old Arabic accusative. This is appended to the substantive:

(a) Most commonly to express *direction towards* an object, or *motion to a place*,² e. g. יָמָה seaward, westward, מִן־הָרָמָה eastward, צָפוֹנָה northward, אֶשְׁרָה to Assyria, בְּבָבֶלָה to Babylon, הָרָה (from הָר) to the mountain, Gn 14¹⁰, אֶרֶצָה to the earth, בֵּיתָה to the house, תִּרְצָחָה to Tirzah (תִּרְצָחָה) 1 K 14¹⁷, &c., עֲזָתָה to Gaza (עֲזָה) Ju 16¹; with the article הָהָרָה to the mountain, הַבֵּיתָה into the house, הַחֲדָרָה into the chamber, 1 K 15¹; הָאֹהֶלָה ³ into the tent, Gn 18⁶, &c.; similarly with adverbs, as שָׁמָּה thither, אֲנִי whither?; even with the *constr. st.* before a genitive בֵּיתָה יוֹסֵף into Joseph's house, Gn 43^{17,24}; הָאֶרֶץ הַזֶּה toward the land of the south, Gn 20¹; אֶרֶצָה מִצְרַיִם to the land of Egypt, Ex 4²⁰; $\text{מִדְבָּרָה דָּמַשְׁק}$ to the wilderness of Damascus, 1 K 19¹⁵; $\text{שָׁמַשׁ מִזְרְחָהּ}$ toward the sun-rising, Dt 4⁴¹; and even with the plural בְּשָׂרֵימָה to the Chaldeans, Ez 11²⁴; הַשָּׁמַיִם towards the heavens.

¹ This rule is almost always observed in the Tell-el-Amarna letters (see § 2 f); cf. the instances cited by Barth, l. c., p. 595, from Winckler's edition.

² On this meaning of the accusative see the Syntax, § 118 d, and cf. the Latin accusative of motion to a place, as in *Romam profectus est, domum reverti, rus ire*.

³ הָאֹהֶלָה in Baer's text, Gn 18⁶, is an error, according to his preface to Isaiah, p. v.

Rem. The above examples are mostly rendered definite by the article, or by a following genitive of definition, or are proper names. But cases like מָהָרָה, הָרָה, בֵּיתָה show that the locative form of *itself* possessed a defining power.

d (b) In a somewhat weakened sense, indicating the place *where* something is or happens (cf. § 118 d), e.g. מַחֲנֵימָה in Mahanaim, 1 K 4¹⁴; שָׁמָּה *there* (usually *thither*, see c), Jer 18², cf. 2 K 23⁸, and the expression to offer a sacrifice הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, properly *towards the altar* for on the altar. On the other hand, בָּבֶלָה Jer 29¹³, and בָּלָה Hb 3¹¹, are to be regarded as ordinary accusatives of direction, *to Babylon, into the habitation*; also expressions like פָּאת צָפוֹנָה *the quarter towards the north*, Jos 15⁵ (at the beginning of the verse, גְּבוּל קֶרְמָה *the border toward the east*), cf. 18^{15,20}, Ex 26¹⁸, Jer 23⁸.

e (c) The original force of the ending ה־ is also disregarded when it is added to a substantive with a preposition prefixed (cf. also עַד-אֲרָנָה *how long?*), and this not only after לְ, אֶל- or עַד- (which are easily explained), e.g. לְמַעַלָּה upwards, לְמַטָּה downwards, לְשִׁאוֹלָה to Sheol, ψ 9¹⁸; עַד-אַפְּקָה unto Aphek, Jos 13⁴, אֶל-הַצָּפוֹנָה toward the north, Ez 8¹⁴, cf. Ju 20¹⁶; but also after בּ, and even after מִן, e.g. בְּצָנֶבֶת in the south, Jos 15²¹, cf. Ju 14², 1 S 23^{15,19}, 31¹³, 2 S 20¹⁵, Jer 52¹⁰; מִבְּבֶלָה from Babylon, Jer 27¹⁶; cf. 1¹³, Jos 10³⁶, 15¹⁰, Ju 21¹⁹, Is 45⁶.

f Rem. Old locative forms (or original accusatives) are, according to the Masora, still to be found in

(a) לַיְלָה, in pause לַיְלָה, the usual word in prose for *night*, which is always construed as masculine. The nominative of this supposed old accusative¹ appeared to be preserved in the form לַיִל, only used in poetry, Is 16⁸, constr. st. לַיִל (even used for the *absol. st.* in pause Is 21¹¹). Most probably, however, לַיְלָה is to be referred, with Nöldeke and others, to a reduplicated form לִילִי; cf. especially the western Aramaic לִילִיָּא, Syr. lilya, &c.—Another instance is מְאוֹמָה *something*, probably from מְאוֹם, מוֹם spot, point, generally with a negative = *nothing*. Similarly אֶרְצָה Is 8²³ and (in pause) Jb 34¹³, סוּפָתָה Ho 8⁷, and the place-name הֶחָצָה 1 Ch 6⁶³, might be explained as accusatives. Elsewhere, however, the toneless ה־ can be regarded only as a meaningless appendage, or at the most as expressing poetic emphasis; thus אֶרְצָה (in pause) Jb 37¹²; הַפְּוֹתָה death, ψ 116¹⁵; נִגְדָה-נָּפָא ψ 116^{14,18}; נַחֲלָה stream, ψ 124⁴; הַחֲשִׁמְלָה amber, Ez 8² [in 1⁴ הַחֲשִׁמֶל, cf. § 80 k], &c. In Jos 15¹² הַקָּמָה is probably only a scribal error (dittography). In Ju 14¹⁸ instead of the quite unsuitable poetic word הַחֲרָקָה (towards the sun??) read as in 15¹ הַחֲרָרָה to the bride-chamber.

¹ Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 113, also takes it as such, *láyilā* being properly *at night*, then *night* simply. Barth, however (*Sprachwiss. Abhandlungen*, p. 16, note 1), refers it to an original לַיְלָה, like אֶנָּה from אֲנָה.

(b) In the termination הָ often used in poetry with feminines, viz. $\text{גְּ$ אִימָהָ *terror* (= אִימָה), Ex 15¹⁶; עֲזָרָהָ *help* (= עֲזָרָה), ψ 44²⁷, 63⁸, 94¹⁷; יְשׁוּעָהָ *salvation* (= יְשׁוּעָה), ψ 3³, 8c³, Jon 2¹⁰; עוֹלָהָ *unrighteousness* (= עוֹלָה), Ez 28¹⁵, Ho 10¹³, ψ 125³; עֲלָהָ ψ 92¹⁶ *Keth.* Jb 5¹⁶; צָרָהָ ψ 120¹; עִפְפָהָ *darkness*, Jb 10²²; הַמְּוִפְפָהָ Jer 11¹⁵ is corrupt, see the LXX and Commentaries. These cases are not to be taken as double feminine endings, since the loss of the tone on the final syllable could then hardly be explained, but they are further instances of an old accusative of direction or intention. In examples like עֲזָרָהָ for *help* (ψ 44²⁷) this is still quite apparent, but elsewhere it has become meaningless and is used merely for the sake of poetical emphasis.¹

This termination הָ usually has reference to *place* (hence called *h locale*²); sometimes, however, its use is extended to time, as in מִיָּמָה מִיָּמָה *from year to year*. Its use in הָלֵלָה , properly *ad profanum*! = *absit*! is peculiar.

As the termination הָ is almost always toneless (except in מִוִּרְחָה *constr. st.* $\text{וְ$ Dt 4¹; גִּתָּה and עֵתָה Jos 19¹³) it generally, as the above examples show, exercises no influence whatever upon the vowels of the word; in the *constr. st.* מִדְּבָרָה Jos 18¹², 1 K 19¹⁵, and in the proper names גִּתָּה 1 K 2⁴⁰, דִּנָּה 2 S 24⁶ (so Baer; ed. Mant. and Ginsb. דִּנָּה), צִפְרָהָ 2 Ch 14⁹, צִרְתָּנָה 1 K 17⁹, הָרָה 1 K 4¹², an *ä* is retained even in an open tone-syllable (cf., however, בְּרָמָלָה Gn 14¹⁰, בְּרָמָלָה Gn 28² from בְּרָן , with modification of the *a* to *è*; also בְּרָמָלָה 1 S 25⁵ from בְּרָמָל). In segholate forms, as a general rule, the הָ *local* is joined to the already developed form of the *absol. st.*, except that the helping-vowel before הָ naturally becomes *Šewá*, e.g. בְּיָתָהָ , הָאֱהָלָהָ Gn 18⁶, &c.; הַשְּׁעָרָה Jos 17¹⁵, הַשְּׁעָרָה $\text{וְ$ Ju 20¹⁶, &c., but also נַחֲלָהָ Nu 34⁵ (*constr. st.*; likewise to be read in the *absolute* in Ez 47¹⁹, 48²⁸) and שְׁעָרָהָ Is 28⁶ (with *Sillug*); cf. נִנְבָהָ Ez 47¹⁹ and גִּרְנָהָ (Baer, incorrectly, גִּרְנָהָ) Mi 4¹² (both in *pause*).—In the case of feminines ending in הָ the הָ *local* is added to the original feminine ending תָּ (§ 80 b), the *ä* of which (since it then stands in an open tone-syllable) is lengthened to *ā*, e.g. הַרְצָתָהָ .—Moreover the termination הָ is even weakened to $\text{הַ$ in נֹבָהָ to *Nob*, 1 S 21², 22⁹; אֲנָהָ *whither*, 1 K 2^{36.42} and דִּדְנָהָ to *Dedan*, Ez 25¹³.

3. Of the three other terminations הָ may still be regarded as a *h* survival of the old nominative ending. It occurs only in the middle

[¹ The form clings also to a few place-names, as גִּרְנָהָ Dt 10⁷; שְׁלֵשָׁהָ 1 S 9⁴, 2 K 4⁴²; קִהֲלָהָ Nu 33^{22 f.}; יִמְבָּתָהָ verse 33 f.; הַמְּנָתָהָ Jos 19⁴³, &c.; אֶפְרָתָהָ Mi 5¹, &c.]

² Cf. Sarauw, 'Der hebr. Lokativ,' ZA. 1907, p. 183 ff. He derives the הָ from the adverbs שָׁמָּה and אֲנָהָ and holds that it has nothing whatever to do with the old accusative.

³ So Qimhi, and the Mant. ed. (Baer הַשְּׁעָרָה), i.e. locative from שַׁעַר (Is 7²⁰). The reading הַשְּׁעָרָה (Opit., Ginsb.) implies a feminine in הָ .

of a few (often undoubtedly very old) proper names,¹ viz. אֶחָוִי (if compounded of אָחוּ and מִי), חָמוּטַל (for which in Jer 52¹ *Keth.* חָמִטַל), מְתוֹשֶׁלַח and מְתוֹשֶׁלָּח (otherwise in Hebrew only in the plur. מְתִים *men*; to מְתִי corresponds most probably בְּתִי in בְּתוּיָל, Gn 32³¹ (but in ver. 32 פְּנִיָּאל) *face of God* (otherwise only in the plur. פְּנִים *constr. st.* פְּנִי).²—נִשְׁמוֹ Neh 6⁶ (elsewhere נִשְׁמָ), is the name of an Arab, cf. 6¹. On the other hand the terminations ם־ and םֿ are most probably to be regarded (with Barth, l.c., p. 597) as having originated on Hebrew soil in order to emphasize the *constr. st.*, on the analogy of the *constr. st.* of terms expressing relationship.

In view of the analogies in other languages (see b) there is nothing impossible in the view formerly taken here that the *litterae compaginis* ם־ and םֿ are obsolete (and hence no longer understood) case-endings, םֿ being the old genitive and ם־ for the nominative sign *u*. Barth objects that the םֿ and ם־ almost invariably have the tone, whereas the accusative םֿ is toneless, and that they are long, where the Arab. *ī* and *ū* are short. Both these objections, however, lose their force if we consider the special laws of the tone and syllable in Hebrew. The language does not admit a final *ī* or *ū*, and the necessarily lengthened vowel might easily attract the tone to itself. On the other hand a strong argument for Barth's theory is the fact that these *litterae compaginis* are almost exclusively used to emphasize the close connexion of one noun with another, hence especially in the *constr. st.* Consequently it seems in the highest degree probable that all these uses are based upon forms in which the *constr. st.* is expressly emphasized by a special termination, i. e. the *constr. st.* of terms of relationship, אָבִי, אֶחָי, חָמִי from אָב *father*, אָח *brother*, חָמ *father-in-law* (cf. § 96). The instances given under *l* and *m* followed this analogy.

Like םֿ, םֿ is also used only to emphasize the *constr. st.* (see n), and must therefore have a similar origin, but its exact explanation is difficult. According to Barth, this םֿ corresponds to a primitive Semitic *ā* (cf. § 9 q) and is traceable to 'abā, 'ahā, the accusatives of terms of relationship in the *constr. st.*, which have *ā* only before a genitive. Against this explanation it may be objected that there is no trace of the supposed Hebrew accusatives אָבִי, אֶחָי, חָמִי, and only of the analogues בְּנִי. It is also remarkable that so archaic a form should have been preserved (except in בְּנִי) only in two words and those in quite late passages. However we have no better explanation to offer in place of Barth's.

Finally we cannot deny the possibility, in some cases, of Barth's explanation of the םֿ in compound proper names like בְּתוּיָל, &c. (see above), as due to the analogy of terms of relationship with nominative in םֿ. But this in no way militates against the view expressed above, that in some very old names, like פְּנִיָּאל, בְּתוּיָל, &c., the original common nominative sign has simply been preserved.

¹ Cf. the list in L. Kaila, *Zur Syntax des in verbaler Abhängigkeit stehenden Nomens im alttest. Hebr.*, Helsingfors, 1906, p. 54.

² The name נִשְׁמוֹל formerly regarded as a compound of נִשְׁמָ = שֵׁם *name* and מוֹל, is better explained with Prätorius, *ZDMG.* 1903, p. 777, as a name of affection, for נִשְׁמוֹל = שֵׁם מוֹל [but see Driver on I S 1²⁰]; similarly, according to Prätorius, בְּתוּיָל = בְּתִי מוֹל and many others.

The instances found are:

(a) Of the ending '—: עֹזְבֵי הַצֹּאן *his ass's colt*, Gn 49¹¹; שֹׁכְנֵי סִנֶּה (*רָעִי הָאֵלִיל*) *the dweller in the bush*, Dt 33¹⁶ (on שֹׁכְנֵי cf. below Jer 49^{16a}, Ob³); appended to the feminine לֵילָה וַיִּגְנֹבְתִי יוֹם וַיִּגְנֹבְתִי *whether stolen by day or stolen by night*, Gn 31³⁹ (in prose, but in very emphatic speech); מִשְׁפָּט מְלֶאכֶתִּי *plena iustitiae*, Is 1²¹; עַם רַבָּתִי *full of people*, La 1¹ (on the retraction of the tone before a following tone-syllable, cf. § 29 e; in the same verse the second רַבָּתִי and שָׁרָתִי, see below, follow the example of רַבָּתִי, although no tone-syllable follows; cf. also Ho 10¹¹ below); עַל־דְּבָרָתִי מֶלְכִּי־צֶדֶק *after the order of Melchizedek*, ψ 110⁴; cf. also ψ 113⁹, Jer 49^{16b}. To the same category belong the rather numerous cases, in which a preposition is inserted between the *construct state* and its genitive (cf. § 130 a), without actually abolishing the dependent relation, e. g. בְּגוֹיִם רַבָּתִי *she that was great among the nations*, שָׁרָתִי בְּמַדְיָנוֹת *princess among the provinces*, La 1¹; לְרוּשׁ אֹהֲבָתִי *that loveth to tread*, Ho 10¹¹; cf. also Jer 49^{16a}, Ob³.—In Ex 15⁶ נֶאֱדָרְיָ can only be so explained if it is a vocative referring to יְהוָה, but perhaps we should read נֶאֱדָרָה as predicate to מִיָּנֶה.

Further, the *Hireq compaginis* is found with certain particles which are really also nouns in the *constr. st.*, as וְזִלְתִּי (= וְזִלַּת) *except*, מִי (poetical for מִן) *from*, בְּלֹתִי *not*, אֶפְסִי *not* (thrice in the formula אֲנִי אֶפְסִי *I am, and there is none else beside me*; but many take the '— as a suffix here), Is 47^{8,10}, Zp 2¹⁵. [The above are all the cases in which this '— is attached to independent words in the O.T.; it occurs, however, besides] in compound proper names (again attached to the *constr. st.*), as מֶלְכִּי־צֶדֶק (*king of righteousness*), גְּבֻרֵי־אֵל (*man of God*), חֲסִידֵי־אֵל (*favour of God*), and others (cf. also the Punic name *Hannibal*, i. e. חֲסִידֵי־בַעַל *favour of Ba'al*).

Otherwise than in the *constr. st.* the *Hireq compaginis* is only found in participial forms, evidently with the object of giving them more dignity, just as in the case of the construct forms in *î*. We must distinguish, however, between passages in which the participle nevertheless does stand in close connexion, as Gn 49¹¹, Is 22¹⁶ (הֹקְמִי and הֹצֵבִי), also in impassioned speech), Mi 7¹⁴ (probably influenced by Dt 33¹⁶), ψ 101⁵, 113⁷; and passages in which the *î* added to the participle with the article merely serves as an ornamental device of poetic style, e. g. in the late Psalms, 113^{5,6,7,9} (on verse 8 see *n*), 114⁸, 123¹.

In *Kethibh* the termination *î* also occurs four times in יוֹשְׁבֵתִי, i. e. יוֹשְׁבֵתִי *n*, Jer 10¹⁷, 22²³ (before בְּ), Ez 27³ (before עַל־), La 4²¹ (before בְּ). The *Qere* always

requires for it יוֹשֶׁבֶת (or יֹשֵׁב), except in Jer 22²³ יֹשֶׁבֶת; cf. *ibid.* מִקְנֵנִי *Keth.*, מִקְנֵנִי *Qere*, and finally Jer 51¹³ שִׁכְנֵנִי *Keth.*, שִׁכְנֵנִי *Qere*. Perhaps יֹשֶׁבֶתִי and יֹשֶׁבֶתִי are *formae mixtae*, combining the readings יֹשֶׁבֶת, &c. and יֹשֶׁבֶת (2nd fem. perf.), &c., but מִקְנֵנִי may be merely assimilated to יֹשֶׁבֶתִי which immediately precedes it.

The following are simply textual errors: 2 K 4²³ הִלְכֵתִי *Keth.*, due to the preceding אֲתִי, and to be read הִלְכֵת as in the *Qere*; ψ 30⁸ (read הִרְרִי, 113⁸ (read לְהוֹשִׁיבִי), 116¹ (read קוֹל תַּח', as in five other places). On בְּרִיתִי, thrice, in Lv 26⁴², cf. § 128 d.

- o (b) Of the ending יִי (always with the tone): in prose only in the Pentateuch, but in elevated style, Gn 1²⁴ חִית־אָרֶץ *the beast of the earth* (= הָאָרֶץ ver. 25); similarly in ψ 50¹⁰, 79², 104^{11,20}, Is 56⁹ (twice), Zp 2¹⁴; otherwise only in בְּנוֹ צִפּוֹר *son of Zippor*, Nu 23¹⁸; בְּנוֹ בְּעֹר *son of Beor*, Nu 24^{8,15}; and מַעְיֵנו כְּיָם *a fountain of waters*, ψ 114⁸.

§ 91. The Noun with Pronominal Suffixes.

W. Diehl, *Das Pronomen pers. suffixum 2 u. 3 pers. plur. des Hebr.*, Giessen, 1895; A. Ungnad, 'Das Nomen mit Suffixen im Semit.,' *Vienna Oriental Journal*, xx, p. 167 ff.

- a With regard to the connexion of the noun with pronominal suffixes, which then stand in a genitive relation (§ 33 c) and are, therefore, necessarily appended to the *construct state* of the noun, we shall first consider, as in the verb (§ 57 ff.), the forms of the suffixes themselves, and then the various changes in the form of the noun to which they are attached. The nouns are also tabulated in the Paradigms of the flexion of the noun in § 92 ff. Cf. also Paradigm A in the Appendix. We are here primarily concerned with the different forms of the suffixes when added to the singular, plural, and dual.

- b 1. The Suffixes of the singular are—

With nouns ending in a—

Vowel.		Consonant.	
Sing.	1. c. י	יְ	<i>my.</i>
	2. { m. ך	ךְ (pause ךְּ)	} <i>thy.</i>
	{ f. ך	ךָ	
	3. { m. הוּ, ו	וּ (הוּ)	<i>his.</i>
	{ f. הָ	הָ, הָּ	<i>her.</i>

¹ Cf. Kaila, l.c., p. 59 ff.

Vowel.	Consonant.
Plur. 1. c. נִי	נִי our.
2. { m. כֶּם f. כֶּן	{ כֶּם כֶּן } your.
3. { m. הֶם מוֹ	{ הֶם (poet. מוֹ) } eorum.
f. הֵן (הֵן)	הֵן earum.

Rem. 1. There is less variety of forms in these than in the verbal suffixes; *c* the particular forms are used as follows:—

(a) Those without a connecting vowel (on the derivation of these 'connecting vowels' from original stem-vowels, see note on § 58 *f*) are generally joined to nouns of a peculiar form (see § 96), the *constr. st.* of which ends in a vowel, as אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיָּהּ, and אֲבִיו, אֲבִיָּהּ, אֲבִינִי, אֲבִיכֶם, אֲבִיכֶן, אֲבִיהֶם, אֲבִיהֶן, sometimes also to segholate forms ending in *i* from ל"ה stems (see § 93 *x, y*), e. g. פְּרִיָּהֶם *the fruit of them*, Am 9¹⁴ (also פְּרִים Is 37³⁰, &c.), אֲבִיהֶן Jer 29²⁸ (also פְּרִין verse 5); cf., moreover, חֲלֻבָּהֶן Lv 8^{16.25} and similar examples with הֵן (Is 3¹⁷ הֵן) Gn 21²⁸, Ez 13¹⁷, 16⁶³.¹ Also in Gn 1²¹, 4⁴, Ez 10¹², Nah 2⁸, &c., the *Keth.* perhaps intends the singular, לְמִינֶהָ, &c., but the Masora requires the plural with defective *ê*.

(b) The forms with connecting vowels (§ 58 *f*) are joined to nouns ending *d* in a consonant. The connecting vowel is regularly *a* in the 3rd *sing. fem.* הִיא (for *aha*) and 3rd *plur.* הֵנָּה, מוֹ, also in the 3rd *sing. masc.* הִוא (הִוא), since the *ô* is contracted from *a[h]û*, and in the pausal form of the 2nd *masc.* הֵנָּה (a modification of original הֵנָּה).

The forms with *ê* in the above-mentioned persons are common only with nouns in הֵן (from stems ל"ה), *constr. st.* הֵן (cf. § 89 *f*), e. g. שָׂדֵהּ (from *sadaihû*) *his field*; עֵלֶהּ *its leaf*, Is 1³⁰; מְרִאָּהּ *the appearance thereof*, Lv 13⁴ (from *mar' aihâ*; on the *Seghōl* see *k*); but שָׂדֶה *her field*. The orthographic retention of the *î*, e. g. מְעֵשִׂיךָ, מְעֵשִׂיָּהּ, gives to many forms the appearance of plurals; see the instances in § 93 *ss*.

Apart from these ל"ה forms the connecting vowel *ê* in the 3rd pers. occurs only in isolated cases; אֲרִיָּהּ *his light*, Jb 25³; לְמִינֶהּ *after its kind*, Gn 1^{12.25} [+ 12 times]; Na 1¹⁸; in Ju 19²⁴ read פִּילִגְשִׁי as in vv. 2, 25. On the other hand הֵנָּה in the 2nd *sing. fem.* and נִי in the 1st *plur.* are by far the more common forms, while הֵנָּה, נִי are of rare occurrence; see *e*.—Instead of הֵנָּה (כֶּה in Gn 10¹⁹, Ex 13¹⁶, Jer 29²⁵, &c., cf. לֶכֶה § 103 *g*), כֶּם, כֶּן (with *Seuâ mobile*), if the last consonant of the noun is a guttural, the forms are הֵנָּה, כֶּם, כֶּן, e. g. רִיחָךְ *thy spirit*, בְּרֵאךְ *thy creator*, Is 43¹, רִיעֶכֶם *your friend*, Jb 6²⁷ (on such cases as בְּחוֹכְכֶם Hag 2⁵, see § 10 *g*).—With *Nun energicum* (cf. § 58 *i*, and on עֵינֶיךָ Jb 5¹, &c., cf. § 61 *h*) הֵנָּה occurs in Pr 25¹⁶, in principal pause.

2. Rare or incorrect forms are—

Sing. 1st pers. נִי in בְּשׁוֹבְנִי Ez 47⁷ (certainly only a scribal error, caused *e* by וַיִּשְׁבְּנִי in verse 6).

¹ Also in Jer 15¹⁰ read (according to § 61 *h*, end) בְּלִיָּהֶם קָלְלוּנִי; in Ho 7⁶ probably אֲפָהֶם for אֲפָהֶם.

2nd pers. *m.* in pause כָּה־[־], e.g. כַּפָּךָ (*thy hand*), ψ 139⁵, cf. Pr 24¹⁰; once חָנָךְ ψ 53⁶ (cf. the analogous cases in the verbal suffix § 75 *U*); *fem.* הָיְ[־] Ez 5¹² (in 16⁵³ also for שְׁבִיתֶיךָ probably שְׁבִיתֶיךָ is intended), כִּי[־] Jer 11¹⁵, ψ 103³, 116¹⁹, 135⁹ (corresponding to the Aramaic suffix of the 2nd *fem. sing.*; on the wholly abnormal כָּה־[־] Na 2¹⁴, cf. *l*), לְכִי *Keth.* 2 K 4², Ct 2¹³. Also הָ־[־] Is 22¹, Ez 23²³, 25⁴.

3rd pers. הָ־[־] (cf. § 7 *c*), e.g. אָהֳלָה Gn 9²¹, 12⁸, 13³, 35²¹ (always with *Q^{eré}* אָהֳלוֹ); נָחָה Nu 10³⁶; לָחָה Dt 34⁷; פָּלָה Jer 20⁷, Na 2¹ *Q^{eré}*; קָצָה 2 K 19²⁵ *Keth.*, for which קָצוֹ is read in Is 37²⁴; עִירָה and סוּרָה Gn 49¹¹, cf. Ex 22²⁶ (*Q^{eré}* עִירוֹ); סָבָה ψ 10⁹, 27⁵ *Keth.*; הָמוּנָה Ez 31¹⁸, &c., *Keth.*; תְּבוֹנָתָה Ez 48⁸ [altogether fourteen times in the Pentateuch, and some forty times in other books: see Driver, *Samuel*, p. xxxv, and on 2 S 2⁹, 21¹].

3rd *fem.* הָ־[־] for הָ־[־] (with the softening of the *Mappig*, cf. § 23 *k*, and the analogous cases in § 58 *g*) occurs repeatedly before *B^{ghad}hkh^{phath}* and other soft consonants, Ex 9¹⁸ (before י, if the text is right), Lv 13⁴ (before ל), Nu 15^{23,31}, 1 S 1⁹ (unless אָכְלָה, the infin. with *fem.* termination, is intended; שָׁתָה follows), Ez 16⁴⁴, 24⁵ (before ב), 1 S 20²⁰, 2 K 8⁶, Pr 12²⁸ (before א), Na 3⁹ (before ו), ψ 48¹⁴ (before פ), Ez 47¹⁰, Jb 31²² twice (before ת), Is 21², Jer 20¹⁷ (before ה), Nu 32⁴², Am 1¹¹ (before נ), Lv 6² (before ע); even in *pause*, Lv 12^{4 a} and ^{5 b}; Is 23¹⁷, Pr 21²², also with *Zaqeph*, Is 45⁶, Jer 6⁶ (probably), 44¹⁹; on הָשִׁמָּה Lv 26³⁴, &c., see § 67 *y*. Cf. also אָ־[־] Ez 36⁵.—Sometimes the Masora appears (but this is very doubtful) to regard the הָ־[־] with feminines as a shortening of תָּה־[־], e.g. נָצָה Gn 40¹⁰ for נָצַתָּה, פָּנָה Pr 7⁸ for פָּנַתָּה; also ׀־[־] for הָם־[־] in תְּבוֹנִים Ho 13², and עָרַמָּם Jb 5¹³. The examples, however, are for the most part uncertain, e.g. in Is 28⁴ the reading is simply to be emended to בְּבוֹרָה, and in Ze 4² to גִּלְתָּה, Jb 11⁹ to מְדָה, Neh 5¹⁴ to פָּחָה. [See also, after prepositions, § 103 *g*.]

f *Plur.* 1st pers. נוֹ־[־] in *pause* קִימוֹנוֹ Jb 22²⁰ (where, however, קָמוֹנוֹ is certainly to be read); cf. Ru 3² [Is 47¹⁰, cf. § 61 *c*, *h*], and so always בָּלָנוֹ *all of us*, Gn 42¹¹, &c. [cf. בָּנוֹ, לָנוֹ, אִתָּנוֹ, עִמָּנוֹ].

2nd pers. *fem.* כָּנָה Ez 23^{48,49}.

3rd pers. *masc.* מוֹ־[־] ψ 17¹⁰ (on מוֹ in פִּימוֹ in the same verse, and in ψ 58⁷ see *l*); הָם־[־] 2 S 23⁶, according to Sievers probably to call attention to the reading בָּלָהֶם. *Fem.* הָנָה־[־] 1 K 7³⁷, Ez 16⁵³ (in *pause*); נָה־[־] Gn 41²¹; נָה־[־] Gn 30⁴¹; נָה־[־] Ru 1¹⁹; elsewhere generally in *pause* (Gn 21²⁹, 42³⁶, Jer 8⁷, Pr 31²⁹, Jb 39²); finally הֵן as suffix to a noun, only in Is 3¹⁷.

For examples of singulars with plural suffixes see *l*.

g 2. In the *plural masc.* and in the *dual* the suffixes are to be regarded primarily as affixed to the original ending of the *construct state* (׀־[־], cf. § 89 *d*). This ending, however, has been preserved unchanged only in the 2nd *fem.* In most cases it is contracted to ׀־[־], as in the *constr. st.* without suffixes (so throughout the plur. and in the poetical suffix יהוֹ־[־] of the 3rd *sing. masc.*); in the 2nd *masc.* and 3rd *fem. sing.* it is ׀־[־] (cf. *k*). On the 1st *pers.* and 3rd *masc. sing.* see *i*.—Thus there arise the following

Suffixes of Plural Nouns.

h

Singular.	Plural.
1. c. ־ , pause ־ <i>my</i> .	1. c. ־ <i>our</i> .
2. { m. ־ f. ־ , pause ־ } <i>thy</i> .	2. { m. ־ f. ־ } <i>your</i> .
3. { m. ־ , poet. ־ <i>his</i> . f. ־ <i>her</i> .	3. { m. ־ , poet. ־ } <i>their</i> .

Thus the original ־ is (a) contracted in the 3rd sing. masc. ־ and throughout the plural, as ־ , ־ , &c.; (b) retained unchanged in the 1st sing. ־ , the real suffix-ending ־ (see *b*) being united with the final *Yêdh* of the ending ־ ; and in the 2nd fem. sing. ־ , with a *helping-Hireq* after the *Yêdh*. On the other hand (c) the *Yêdh* of ־ is lost in pronunciation and the *â* lengthened to *ā* in the 3rd masc. sing. ־ , i. e. *sûsāw* (pronounced *susā-u*).¹ The 2nd masc. sing. ־ and the 3rd fem. sing. ־ were formerly also explained here as having really lost the ־ , and modified the *a* of *sûsakā*, *sûsakā* to *Sêghêl*; but cf. the view now given in *g* and *k*.

Rem. 1. As ־ represents *sûsai-nû*, so ־ and ־ represent *sûsai-kā*, *k* *sûsai-hā*, and the use of *Sêghêl* instead of the more regular *Sere* is to be explained from the character of the following syllable,—so P. Haupt who points to ־ as compared with ־ . In support of the view formerly adopted by us that the ־ is only orthographically retained, too much stress must not be laid on the fact that it is sometimes omitted,² thereby causing confusion in an unpointed text with the singular noun. A number of the examples which follow may be due to an erroneous assumption that the noun is a plural, where in reality it is a singular, and others may be incorrect readings. Cf. ־ *thy ways* (probably ־ is intended), Ex 33¹³, Jos 1⁸, ψ 119³⁷; for other examples, see Jos 21^{11 ff.} (־ ; but in 1 Ch 6^{40 ff.} always ־), Ju 19⁹, 1 K 8²⁹, Is 58¹³, ψ 119^{41.43.98} (probably, however, in all these cases the sing. is intended); Nu 30⁸, ־ Jer 19⁸, 49¹⁷; ־ Dn 11⁶. For the orthographic omission of the ־ before suffixes cf. also ־ for ־ *his friends*, 1 S 30²⁶, Pr 29¹⁸; Jb 42¹⁰ (but it is possible to explain it here as a collective singular); ־ *our iniquities*, Is 64^{5.6}, Jer 14⁷; Ex 10⁹, Neh 10¹ (־ from ־ which is always written defectively); Nu 29³³, ־ Jer 44⁹; ־ ψ 134²; ־ *after their kinds*, Gn 1²¹ (but see *c*), cf. 4⁴ and Na 2⁸. The

¹ In the papyrus of the decalogue from the Fayyûm, line 16, ־ occurs 16 times. Gall, *ZAW.* 1903, p. 349, takes this as an indication that the traditional forms of the noun-suffix ־ or ־ represent *aiû* or *eu*. P. Haupt aptly compares the Greek use of the *iota subscript* ($\tilde{\alpha}$).

² So in the Mēšā' inscription, l. 22 ־ *its towers* (along with ־ *its gates*). Can it have been the rule to omit ־ after the termination *ôth*? Cf. below, *n*.

defective writing is especially frequent in the 3rd masc. sing. וְיָ , which in *Qerê* is almost always changed to וִי , e.g. הָצִוָּ הָצִוָּ his arrows, ψ 58⁸, *Qerê* הָצִוָּ . On יְהִי , only three times יְהִי , cf. § 135 r.

- l 2. Unusual forms (but for the most part probably only scribal errors) are—
Sing. 2nd pers. fem יְיָ (after אַשְׁרֵי happy! Ec 10¹⁷, which has become stereotyped as an interjection, and is therefore unchangeable; cf. Delitzsch on the passage); יְיָ (cf. Syr. כִּי) 2 K 4³, and יְיָ in *Keeth.*, ψ 103³⁻⁵, 116⁷ (יְיָ in pause).—In Ez 16³¹ יְיָ (so יְיָ in 6⁸) occurs with an *infin.* ending in וְיָ , the וְיָ being therefore treated as a plural ending; similarly, the plural suffix is sometimes found with the feminine ending וְיָ (Nu 14³³, Is 54⁴, Jer 3⁸, Ez 16¹⁵, 23⁷, as well as in 16²⁰ *Qerê*, and Zp 3²⁰), with the ending *ith* (Lv 5²⁴, reading הַמִּשְׁתָּוִי), and even with the ordinary feminine ending *ath*; Is 47¹³, Ez 35¹¹, ψ 9¹⁵, Ezr 9¹⁵.—Wholly abnormal is מְלָאֲכָנָה thy messengers, Na 2¹⁴, evidently a case of dittography of the following הָ : read מְלָאֲכָנָה .

3rd masc. יְהִי Hb 3¹⁰, Jb 24²³; הָ 1 S 30²⁶, Ez 43¹⁷, Na 2⁴; וְיָ (a purely Aramaic form) ψ 116¹².—3rd fem. יְהִי Ez 41¹⁵.

Plur. The strange 2nd pers. masc. הַפְּצוֹתֶיכֶם (with י , so Qimhi; cf. Norzi) Jer 25³⁴, is probably a mixed form combining הַפְּצוֹתֶיךָ and הַפְּצוֹתֶיכֶם ; fem. יְיָנָה Ez 13²⁰.

3rd masc. יְהִימָה Ez 40¹⁶; fem. יְהִינָה Ez 1¹¹.

3. The termination וְיָ (also with the *dual*, e.g. ψ 58⁷, 59¹³), like מִוְיָ and מִוְיָ , occurs with the noun (as with the verb, § 58 g) almost exclusively in the later poets [viz. with a substantive in the singular. ψ 21¹¹, 17^{10,10}, 58⁷, 59¹³, 89¹⁸; with a dual or plural, Dt 32^{27,32,37,38}, 33²⁹, ψ 23³, 11⁷, 35¹⁶, 49¹², 58⁷, 59¹⁴, 73^{5,7}, 83^{12,12}, 140^{4,10}, Jb 27²³; after prepositions, see § 103 f, o, notes], and cannot, therefore, by itself be taken as an indication of archaic language. On the other hand there can be no doubt that these are revivals of really old forms. That they are consciously and artificially used is shown by the evidently intentional accumulation of them, e.g. in Ex 15^{5,7,9}, ψ 23⁵, and 140^{4,10}, and also by the fact observed by Diehl (see the heading of this section) that in Ex 15 they occur *only* as verbal suffixes, in Dt 32 *only* as noun suffixes.

- m 3. It is clear and beyond doubt that the *Yôdh* in these suffixes with the plural noun belongs, in reality, to the ending of the *construct state* of the masculine plural. Yet the consciousness of this fact became so completely lost as to admit of the striking peculiarity (or rather inaccuracy) of appending those *suffix-forms* which include the plural ending וְיָ , even to the feminine plural in וְיָ (קִיסוֹתֵינוּ , קִיסוֹתֶיךָ , &c.), so that in reality the result is a double indication of the plural.¹

- n Such is the rule: the singular suffix, however (see b), also occurs with the ending וְיָ (probably through the influence of Aramaic), e.g. עֲדוֹתִי ψ 132¹² (unless it be *sing.* for עֲדוֹתִי , as, according to Qimhi in his Lexicon, 2 K 6⁸ is for הַחֲנוּתִי ; מִכְתָּרִי Dt 28⁵⁹ (treated on the analogy of an *infin.* לִי);

¹ See an analogous case in § 87 s. Cf. also the double feminine ending in the 3rd sing. perf. of verbs לִי , § 75 i.

אֲחֵיהֶם Ez 16⁵². On the other hand מִצֹּתָךְ (so Baer, Ginsb. ; but Opit. מִצֹּתְךָ) ψ 119⁶⁸, Dn 9⁵ is merely written defectively, like מִצֹּתְךָ according to Baer (not Ginsb.) in Pr 1⁹, &c. In the 3rd plur. the use of the singular suffix is even the rule in the earlier Books (see the instances in Diehl, l. c., p. 8), e. g. אֲבוֹתָם (their fathers) oftener than אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם (this only in 1 K 14¹⁵, and in Jer, Ezr, Neh, and Ch [in 1 K, Jer, Ezr, however, אֲבוֹתָם is more common]); so always שְׁמוֹתָם, שְׁמוֹתֵיהֶם their names, דִּירוֹתָם, דִּירוֹתֵיהֶם their generations. From parallel passages like 2 S 22⁴⁶ compared with ψ 18⁴⁶, Is 2⁴ with Mi 4³, it appears that in many cases the longer form in מִצֹּתְךָ can only subsequently have taken the place of מִצֹּתְךָ.

4. The following Paradigm of a masculine and feminine noun *o* with suffixes is based upon a monosyllabic noun with one unchangeable vowel. With regard to the ending ת in the constr. st. of the fem. it should be further remarked that the short *ä* of this ending is only retained before the grave suffixes כֶּם and כֵּן; before all the others (the light suffixes) it is lengthened to *ā*.

		Singular.			
		Masculine.		Feminine.	p
		סוּם a horse.		סוּמָה a mare.	
Sing. 1.	com.	סוּמִי my horse.		סוּמָתִי my mare.	
	{ m.	סוּמְךָ thy horse.		סוּמָתְךָ thy mare.	
	{ f.	סוּמְךָ thy horse.		סוּמָתְךָ thy mare.	
3.	{ m.	סוּמוֹ equus eius (suus).		סוּמָתוֹ equa eius (sua).	
	{ f.	סוּמָהּ equus eius (suus).		סוּמָתָהּ equa eius (sua).	
Plur. 1.	com.	סוּמֵינוּ our horse.		סוּמָתֵינוּ our mare.	
	{ m.	סוּמֵיכֶם your horse.		סוּמָתֵיכֶם your mare.	
	{ f.	סוּמֵיכֶן your horse.		סוּמָתֵיכֶן your mare.	
3.	{ m.	סוּמָם equus eorum (suus).		סוּמָתָם equa eorum (sua).	
	{ f.	סוּמָן equus earum (suus).		סוּמָתָן equa earum (sua).	
		Plural.			
		Masculine.		Feminine.	q
		סוּמִים horses.		סוּמוֹת mares.	
Sing. 1.	com.	סוּמִי my horses.		סוּמוֹתִי my mares.	
	{ m.	סוּמֵיךָ thy horses.		סוּמוֹתֵיךָ thy mares.	
	{ f.	סוּמֵיךָ thy horses.		סוּמוֹתֵיךָ thy mares.	
3.	{ m.	סוּמֵי equi eius (sui).		סוּמוֹתֵי equae eius (suae).	
	{ f.	סוּמֵיהָ equi eius (sui).		סוּמוֹתֵיהָ equae eius (suae).	
Plur. 1.	com.	סוּמֵינוּ our horses.		סוּמוֹתֵינוּ our mares.	
	{ m.	סוּמֵיכֶם your horses.		סוּמוֹתֵיכֶם your mares.	
	{ f.	סוּמֵיכֶן your horses.		סוּמוֹתֵיכֶן your mares.	
3.	{ m.	סוּמֵיהֶם equi eorum (sui).		סוּמוֹתֵיהֶם equae eorum (suae).	
	{ f.	סוּמֵיהֶן equi earum (sui).		סוּמוֹתֵיהֶן equae earum (suae).	

§ 92. *Vowel Changes in the Noun.*

- a* 1. Vowel changes in the noun may be caused (*a*) by dependence on a following genitive, (*b*) by connexion with pronominal suffixes, (*c*) by the plural and dual terminations, whether in the form of the absolute state or of the construct (before a following genitive of a noun or suffix).
- b* 2. In all these cases, the tone of the noun is moved forward either one or two syllables, while the tone of the *construct state* may even be thrown upon the following word. In this way the following changes may arise:—

(*a*) When the tone is moved forward only one place, as is the case when the plural and dual endings ים, וֹת, and יִם are affixed, as well as with all monosyllabic or paroxytone suffixes, then in dissyllabic nouns the originally short vowel of the first syllable (which was lengthened as being in an open syllable before the tone) becomes Šewā, since it no longer stands before the tone. On the other hand, the originally short, but tone-lengthened vowel, of the second syllable is retained as being now the pretonic vowel; e.g. דָּבָר word (ground-form *dābār*), plur. דְּבָרִים; with a light suffix beginning with a vowel, דְּבָרִי, דְּבָרָנִי, plur. דְּבָרַי, דְּבָרֶיךָ, &c.; פֶּנֶף wing, dual פְּנֵפִים. With an unchangeable vowel in the second syllable: פֶּקִיד overseer, plur. פְּקִידִים; with the suffix of the sing. פְּקִידִי, &c.; with the suff. of the plur. פְּקִידֵי, פְּקִידֶיךָ, &c. With an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable: עוֹלָם eternity, plur. עוֹלָמִים, with suff. עוֹלָמִי, &c.¹

- c* But in participles of the form קָטַל, with tone-lengthened ē (originally *ī*) in the second syllable, the ē regularly becomes Šewā mobile before a tone-bearing affix, e.g. אֹיֵב enemy, plur. אֹיְבִים, with suff. אֹיְבֵי, &c. Likewise in words of the form קָטַל, קָטַל, &c. (with ē in the second syllable; § 84^b *d, l, p*; § 85 *i and k*), e.g. אֵלֵם dumb, plur. אֵלִים.

- d* (*b*) When the tone of the *construct state*, plural or dual, is carried over to the following word, or, in consequence of the addition of the *grave suffixes* to the *constr. st.* plur. or dual, is moved forward two places within the word itself, in such cases the originally short vowel of the second syllable becomes Šewā, while the vowel of the first syllable reverts to its original shortness, e.g. הָעָם דְּבָרֵי the words of the people, דְּבָרֵיכֶם your words, דְּבָרֵיהֶם their words (in all which instances the *ī* of the first syllable is attenuated from an original *ā*).

¹ The participles Niph'al נִדְּחָה Dt 30⁴, נִדְּחָה 2 S 14¹³, and some plurals of the participle Niph. of verbs נִלְּחָ form an exception; cf. § 93 *oo*.

In the segholate forms in the singular and mostly in the dual the suffix is *e* appended to the ground-form (מֶלֶכִּי *my king*, מְלָכָיו, &c.); on the other hand, before the endings ים, וֹת (sometimes also before ים) a *Qames* regularly occurs,¹ before which the vowel of the first syllable then becomes vocal *Šewā* (מְלָכִים, מְלָכוֹת). This *Qames* (on which cf. § 84^a) remains even before the light suffixes, when attached to the plur. masc. (מְלָכִיךָ, מְלָכֶיךָ, &c.). On the other hand, the *constr. st.* plur. and dual, regularly, according to *ā*, has the form מְלָכֵי, with grave suffix מְלָכֵיכֶם, &c., דְּלָתַי from דְּלָתַיִם *folding-doors*.

(c) Before the *Šewā mobile* which precedes the suffix ה when *f* following a consonant, the *a*-sound, as a rule, is the only tone-lengthened vowel which remains in the final syllable (being now in an open syllable *before* the tone), e.g. דְּמָרְךָ, דְּבָרְךָ, &c. (on the forms with *ē* in the second syllable, see § 93 *qq*); but before the grave suffixes כֶּם and כֵּן in the same position it reverts to its original shortness, as דְּבָרְכֶם (*dēbhārkhēm*), &c. In the same way the tone-lengthened *ā* or *ē* of the second syllable in the *constr. st.* sing. also becomes short again, since the *constr. st.* resigns the principal tone to the following word, e.g. דְּבַר אֱלֹהִים; חֵצֵר הַפֶּתַח (from חֵצֵר).

Rem. The Masora (cf. *Digduqe ha-š'amim*, p. 37) reckons thirteen words *g* which retain *Qames* in the *constr. st.*, some of which had originally *ā* and therefore need not be considered. On the other hand, אֵלֶם or אֵלֶם 1 K 7⁶, Ez 40⁴⁸, &c. (in spite of the *constr. st.* plur. אֵלֶיךָ); מִבְּטָח ψ 65⁶, Pr 25¹⁹; מִצֵּב 1 S 13²³ (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c. מִצֵּב); מִשְׁקָל Ezr 8³⁰ and מִתֵּן Pr 18¹⁶ are very peculiar.

3. The vowel changes in the inflexion of *feminine nouns* (§ 95) are *h* not so considerable, since generally in the formation of the feminine either the original vowels have been retained, or they have already become *Šewā*.

Besides the vowel changes discussed above in *a-g*, which take place according to the general formative laws (§§ 25-28), certain further phenomena must also be considered in the inflexion of nouns, an accurate knowledge of which requires in each case an investigation of the original form of the words in question (see §§ 84-86). Such are, e.g., the rejection of the ה of לָה stems before all formative additions (cf. § 91 *d*), the sharpening of the final consonant of ע"ע stems in such cases as חָקִי, חָקִי, &c.

A striking difference between the vowel changes in the verb and noun is *k* that in a verb when terminations are added it is mostly the second of two changeable vowels which becomes *Šewā* (קָטַל, קָטַלָה, קָטַלְתָּ), but in a noun, the first (דְּבַר, דְּבָרִי, דְּבָרֶיךָ), cf. § 27. 3.

¹ For the rare exceptions see § 93 *l* and § 97 *f*, note 2.

§ 93. *Paradigms of Masculine Nouns.*¹

a Masculine nouns from the simple stem may, as regards their form and the vowel changes connected with it, be divided into *four* classes. A synopsis of them is given on pp. 264, 265, and they are further explained below. Two general remarks may be premised :

- (*a*) That all feminines without a distinctive termination (§ 122 *h*) are treated like these masculine nouns, e. g. חֶרֶב *f.* sword, like מֶלֶךְ *m.* king, except that in the *plural* they usually take the termination וֹת; thus חֶרֶבוֹת, *constr.* חֲרֻבוֹת (and so always before *suffixes*, see § 95).
- (*b*) That in the plural of the first three classes a changeable vowel is always retained even before the light suffixes as a lengthened pretonic vowel, whenever it also stands before the plural ending יִם. All suffixes, except כֶּם, כֹּן, הֶם, הֵן, יָכֶם, יָכֹן, יָהֶם, יָהֵן, are called *light*. Cf. § 92 *e*.

Explanations of the Paradigms (see pp. 264, 265).

c 1. Paradigm I comprises the large class of *segholate* nouns (§ 84^a *a-e*). In the first three examples, from a strong stem, the ground-forms, *mālk*, *sīphr*, *qūdš* have been developed by the adoption of a helping *Seghôl* to מֶלֶךְ (with *ā* modified to *è*), מִסְפָּר (י lengthened to *ē*), קִדְּשׁ (*ū* lengthened to *ō*).² The next three examples, instead of the helping *Seghôl*, have a helping *Pathah*, on account of the middle (*d*, *f*) or final guttural (*e*). In all these cases the *constr. st. sing.* coincides exactly with the *absolute*. The singular suffixes are added to the ground-form; but in *c* and *f* an *ō* takes the place of the original *ū*, and in *d* and *f* the guttural requires a repetition of the *ā* and *ō* in the form of a *Hateph* (נֶעֱרִי, פֶּעֱלִי); before a following *Sevâ* this *Hateph* passes into a simple helping vowel (*ā*, *ō*), according to § 28 *c*; hence נֶעֱרַךְ, &c.

d In the plural an *a*-sound almost always appears before the tone-bearing affix יִם (on the analogy of forms with original *a* in the

¹ A sort of detailed commentary on the following scheme of Hebrew declensions is supplied by E. König in his *Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Spr.*, ii. 1, p. 1 ff.

² According to P. Haupt 'The book of Nahum' in the *Journ. of bibl. Lit.*, 1907, p. 29, the *e* in מִסְפָּר and the *o* in קִדְּשׁ are not long but accented, and hence to be pronounced σέφρ, ὅζν (אֲזִן), a theory unknown at any rate to the Jewish grammarians.

second syllable; cf. § 84^a a), in the form of a pretonic *Qames*, whilst the short vowel of the first syllable becomes vocal *S^ewd*. The original *a* of the 2nd syllable is elided in the *construct state*, so that the short vowel under the first radical then stands in a closed syllable. The omission of *Dageš* in a following *Begadkephath* (מִלְכִּי, not מִלְכִּי, &c.) is due to the loss of a vowel between ל and כ. On the other hand, the pretonic *Qames* of the *absolute state* is retained before the light plural suffixes, whilst the grave suffixes are added to the form of the *construct state*.—The ending of the *absolute state* of the dual is added, as a rule, to the ground-form (so in *a-d* and *h*, but cf. *k*). The *construct state* of the dual is generally the same as that of the plural, except, of course, in cases like *m*.

Paradigms *g* and *h* exhibit forms with middle *u* and *i* (§ 84^a c, γ e and δ); the ground forms *maut* and *zait* are always contracted to *môth*, *zêth*, except in the *absol. sing.*, where *u* and *i* are changed into the corresponding consonants ו and י.

Paradigm *i* exhibits one of the numerous forms in which the contraction of a middle *u* or *i* has already taken place in the *absol. sing.* (ground-form *šaut*).

Paradigm *k* is a formation from a stem ל"ה (§ 84^a c, ε).

Paradigms *l*, *m*, *n* are forms from stems ע"ע, and hence (see § 67 a) *f* originally biliteral, *yam*, 'im, *huq*, with the regular lengthening to ים, ים, חק. Before formative additions a sharpening, as in the inflexion of verbs ע"ע, takes place in the second radical, e.g. אָמַי, אָמִים, &c. (see § 84^a c, β).

REMARKS.

I. A. On I. *a* and *d* (ground-form *qatl*). In *pause* the full lengthening to ā *g* generally takes place, thus בָּרֶם vineyard, זָרַע, זֶרַע seed (from זָרַע), and so always (except ψ 48¹¹), in אָרֶץ earth with the article, הָאָרֶץ, according to § 35 o (cf. also in the LXX the forms 'ΑΒέλ, 'Ιαφέθ for הָבֵל, יֹפֶת). However, the form with è is also sometimes found in *pause*, along with that in ā, e.g. הָסָר together with הָסַר; and very frequently only the form with *S^eghôl*, e.g. מָלַךְ, יָשַׁע grass, נָצַח perpetuity, פָּלָא a wonder, צָדַק righteousness, קָדַם the East, יָשַׁע help, &c.—With two *S^eghôls*, although with a middle guttural, we find לָחֶם bread (in *pause* לָחֶם) and רָחֶם womb (in *pause* רָחֶם), besides רָחַם Ju 5³⁰ (in *pause* רָחַם). A helping *S^eghôl* always stands before a final א, as דָּשָׁא, טָנָא (with *sufl.* טָנָא), פָּלָא, פָּרָא (also written פָּרָה), except in נִיָּא, see v.

B. The *constr. st.* is almost always the same as the *absolute*. Sometimes, *h* however, under the influence of a final guttural or ר, Pathah appears in the second syllable as the principal vowel (see below, s), e.g. זָבַר ψ 18²⁶; זָרַע

Paradigms of

I.

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	מֶלֶךְ (king)	סֵפֶר (book)	קֹדֶשׁ (sanctuary)	נָעַר (a youth)	נֶצַח (perpetuity)	פֶּעַל (work)
„ <i>construct</i>	מֶלֶךְ	סֵפֶר	קֹדֶשׁ	נָעַר	נֶצַח	פֶּעַל
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	מֶלְכִי	סִפְרִי	קֹדֶשִׁי	נָעָרִי	נֶצַחִי	פִּעְלִי
	מֶלְכֶךְ	סִפְרֶךְ	קֹדֶשֶׁךְ	נָעָרֶךְ	נֶצַחֶךְ	פִּעְלֶךְ
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	מֶלְכְּכֶם	סִפְרְכֶם	קֹדֶשְׁכֶם	נָעָרְכֶם	נֶצַחְכֶם	פִּעְלְכֶם
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מְלָכִים	סִפְרִים	[קֹדֶשִׁים]	נָעָרִים	נֶצַחִים	פִּעְלִים
„ <i>construct</i>	מְלָכִי	סִפְרִי	קֹדֶשִׁי	נָעָרִי	נֶצַחִי	פִּעְלִי
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	מְלָכִי	סִפְרִי	[קֹדֶשִׁי]	נָעָרִי	נֶצַחִי	פִּעְלִי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	מְלָכֵיכֶם	סִפְרֵיכֶם	קֹדֶשֵׁיכֶם	נָעָרֵיכֶם	נֶצַחֵיכֶם	פִּעְלֵיכֶם
<i>Dual absolute</i>	רַגְלַיִם (feet)	קַבְצָיִם (two heaps)	מַתְנֵי (loins)	נַעֲלָיִם (sandals)		
	[proper name.]					
„ <i>construct</i>	רַגְלִי		מַתְנֵי	נַעֲלִי		

II.

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	דָּבָר (word)	חָכָם (wise)	זָקֵן (an old man)	פֶּתֶף (shoulder)	חֲצָר (court)	שָׂדֶה (field)
„ <i>construct</i>	דָּבָר	חָכָם	זָקֵן	פֶּתֶף	חֲצָר	שָׂדֶה
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	דְּבָרִי	חֲכָמִי	זָקֵנִי	פֶּתְפִי	חֲצָרִי	שָׂדִי
	דְּבָרֶךְ	חֲכָמֶךְ				שָׂדֶךְ
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	דְּבָרְכֶם	חֲכָמְכֶם				
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	דְּבָרִים	חֲכָמִים	זָקֵנִים		חֲצָרִים	פְּנִים
„ <i>construct</i>	דְּבָרִי	חֲכָמִי	זָקֵנִי		חֲצָרִי	פְּנִי
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	דְּבָרִי	חֲכָמִי	זָקֵנִי		חֲצָרִי	פְּנִי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	דְּבָרֵיכֶם	חֲכָמֵיכֶם	זָקֵנֵיכֶם		חֲצָרֵיכֶם	פְּנֵיכֶם
<i>Dual absolute</i>	כַּנְפָּיִם (wings)	חֻלְצָיִם (loins)	יֶרְכָּיִם (thighs)			(face)
„ <i>construct</i>	כַּנְפִּי					

Masculine Nouns.

I.

<i>g.</i>	<i>h.</i>	<i>i.</i>	<i>k.</i>	<i>l.</i>	<i>m.</i>	<i>n.</i>
מָוֹת (death)	זַיִת (olive)	שׁוֹט (whip)	פֶּרִי (fruit)	יָם (sea)	אִם (mother)	חָק (statute)
מוֹת	זַיִת	שׁוֹט	פֶּרִי	יָם, יָם	אִם	חָק
מוֹתֵי	זַיִתֵּי	שׁוֹטֵי	פֶּרִיֵּי	יָמֵי	אִמִּי	חֻקִּי
כּוֹתֵךְ	זַיִתְךָ	שׁוֹטְךָ	פֶּרִיְךָ	יָמְךָ	אִמְךָ	חֻקְךָ
מוֹתֵכֶם	זַיִתְכֶם	שׁוֹטְכֶם	פֶּרִיְכֶם	יָמֵיכֶם	אִמְכֶם	חֻקְכֶם
[מוֹתֵי]	זַיִתִּים	שׁוֹטִים	פֶּרִיִּים	יָמִים	אִמּוֹת	חֻקִּים
מוֹתֵי	זַיִתֵּי	שׁוֹטֵי	פֶּרִיֵּי	יָמֵי	אִמּוֹת	חֻקִּי
	זַיִתֵּי	שׁוֹטֵי	(kids)	יָמֵי	אִמּוֹתֵי	חֻקִּי
	זַיִתְכֶם	שׁוֹטְכֶם		יָמֵיכֶם	אִמּוֹתֵיכֶם	חֻקְכֶם
	עֵינַיִם	יוֹמִים	לְחָיִים	כַּפַּיִם	שִׁנַּיִם	
	(eyes)	(two days, biduum)	(cheeks)	(hands)	(teeth)	
	עֵינִי		לְחָיֵי	כַּפֵּי	שִׁנָּי	

III.

IV.

<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>	<i>c.</i>	<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>	<i>c.</i>
עוֹלָם (eternity)	אֵיב (enemy)	חֹזֶה (seer)	פֶּקִיד (overseer)	עָנִי (poor)	כְּתָב (writing)
עוֹלָם	אֵיב	חֹזֶה	פֶּקִיד	עָנִי	כְּתָב
עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חֹזִי	פֶּקִידִי		כְּתָבִי
עוֹלְמְךָ	אֵיבְךָ	חֹזֶךָ	פֶּקִידְךָ		כְּתָבְךָ
עוֹלְמֵכֶם	אֵיבְכֶם	חֹזְכֶם	פֶּקִידְכֶם		כְּתָבְכֶם
עוֹלָמִים	אֵיבִים	חֹזִים	פֶּקִידִים	עָנִיִּים	[כְּתָבִים]
עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חֹזִי	פֶּקִידִי	עָנִי	[כְּתָבִי]
עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חֹזִי	פֶּקִידִי		[כְּתָבִי]
עוֹלְמֵיכֶם	אֵיבְכֶם	חֹזְכֶם	פֶּקִידְכֶם	עָנִיְכֶם	[כְּתָבֵיכֶם]
מְלָאָכָיִם	מֵאֻנָּה		שָׁבָעִים		
(pair of tongs)	(balance)		(two weeks)		
	מֵאֻנִּי				

(only in Nu 11⁷, before Maqqeph), חָרָר Ju 3²⁴ (but Ct 3⁴ חָרָר, נָטַע, סָחַר, נָטַע, as well as נָרַע, &c.; cf., moreover, קָחַת 2 K 12⁹ (for קָחַת, *infin. constr.* from לָקַח).

i C. The הָ *locale* is, according to § 90 *i*, regularly added to the already developed form, e.g. נָנְדָה ψ 116^{14,18}: הַפְתָּחָה Gn 19⁶, to the door; but also with a firmly closed syllable נָנְדָה Ex 4c²⁴; under the influence of a guttural or ר, חָרָה, חָרָה, in *pause* אָרָצָה (cf. אָרָה 1 Ch 14¹⁸, from אָרָר).

k D. The suffixes of the singular are likewise added to the ground-form, but forms with middle guttural take *Haṭeph-Pathah* instead of the *Ṣewā quiescens*; נָעָרִי, &c. (but also לָחֲמִי, וְעָמִי, &c.). In a rather large number of *qāṭl*-forms, however, before suffixes in the sing., as well as in the *constr. st. plur.* and dual, the *ā* of the first syllable is attenuated to *ī*,¹ thus בְּסוּמִי *my womb*, יִתְרוֹ; so in בָּנָר, בָּצַע, בָּנוֹעַ, זָבַח, טָבַח, פָּשַׁע, פָּחַח, צָדָק, קָבֵר, קָרֵב, רָשַׁע, שָׁמֵשׁ, and many others. In some cases of this kind besides the form with *ā* there most probably existed another with original *ī* in the first syllable; thus certainly with יִשַׁע beside יִשְׁעָה, נִצָּח beside נִצְחָה, &c. (According to the *Diqduq ha-ṭ'amim*, § 36, the *absolute st.* in such cases takes *ē*, the *constr. st.* *ē*; cf. נָרָר Nu 30⁴ (*absol.*) and נָרָר 30¹⁰ (*constr.*); שָׁבֵר Lv 24²⁰ (*absol.*) and שָׁבֵר Am 6⁶ (*constr.*). According to this theory² פָּלָא (so the best authorities) Is 9⁵ would be the *constr. st.*, although the accentuation requires an *absol. st.*)—A weakening of the firmly closed syllable occurs in בָּנְרִי, &c. from בָּנָר and יִקְבֵּד Dt 15¹⁴, 16¹³, in both cases evidently owing to the influence of the palatal in the middle of the stem. With *S^{ghōl}* for *ī*: הָבְלִי, יִשְׁעָךְ, נָנְדִי, &c.

l E. In the plural the termination וֹת is found as well as יִם, e.g. נִפְשֹׁת, נִפְשֹׁת together with נִפְשִׁים (Ez 13²⁰ [but read נִפְשִׁים; see comm.]), &c., *constr. st.* נִפְשֹׁת. Other nouns have only the ending וֹת, e.g. אֲרָצֹת, *constr.* אֲרָצִים from אָרֶץ. Without *Qameṣ* before the ending יִם we find רַחֲמִים (*bowels*) *mercy*. On the numerals עֶשְׂרִים *twenty*, &c., cf. § 97 *f*, note 2. Moreover *a* is not inserted before plural suffixes with the tone on the penultima in אֲשֵׁרֶךְ, &c., properly *thy happiness!* (a word which is only used in the *constr. st. pl.* and at an early period became stereotyped as a kind of interjection).

m F. In the *constr. st. plural* a firmly closed syllable is sometimes found, contrary to the rule, e.g. בְּסִפְיָהֶם Gn 42^{25,35}; רִשְׁפֵי Ct 8⁶ (רִשְׁפֵי ψ 76⁴); טִרְפֵי Ez 17⁹; צִמְיֵי Is 5¹⁶, and so always in נִסְפִיָּהֶם Nu 29⁸⁹, נִסְפִיָּהֶם ψ 16⁴, &c. (on the other hand, according to the best authorities *not* in חֲסִרֵי Is 55³, &c., though in ψ 107⁴³ Ginsburg reads חֲסִרֵי); cf. § 46 *d*. Even with a middle guttural בְּעִלְיָהֶן Est 1^{17,20}.—The attenuation of *ā* to *ī* also occurs sometimes in this form (see above, *k*), e.g. זִבְחֵי, &c., even יִלְדֵי Is 57⁴ beside יִלְדֵי Ho 1², &c.

n G. In the *dual absol.* beside forms like רַגְלָיִם *feet*, with suff. רַגְלָיִךְ, רַגְלָי, &c. רַגְלָיִם *two thousand*, נַעֲלָיִם *sandals*, בְּרָכָיִם *knees* (*ā* attenuated to *ī*, *constr. st.* בְּרָכֵי with a firmly closed syllable), with suffixes בְּרָכֵי, &c. (cf., however, בְּרָכִיָּהֶם Ju 7⁸), forms with pretonic *Qameṣ* are also found (in consequence of the

¹ According to M. Lambert, *REJ.* 1896, p. 21, *a* tends to remain with labials; so in 14 cases out of 22 masculines, and in 3 out of 6 feminines.

² Probably only a theory of one particular school and not generally accepted, or at any rate not consistently carried out; cf. König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 22.

tendency to assimilate the dual to the plural in form: so König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 17), as קַרְנִים *horns*, with suff. קַרְנָיו (Dn 8³ ^α; elsewhere always קַרְנִים, קַרְנָיו, &c.), and so always דְּלָתַיִם *constr. st.* דְּלָתֵי *folding-doors*, דְּרָכַיִם (?) *double way*.

2. On Paradigms *b* and *e*. With a final מ rejected (but retained orthographically) we find חַמָּה *sin*. An initial guttural before suffixes generally receives *S^ghōl* instead of the original *ī*, e.g. עֹרִי, חֲלָקִי, &c., so in the *constr. st. plur.* עֹרָיו, &c.; חַמָּה forms חַמָּתַי 2 K 1c²⁹, &c., retaining the *Qameṣ* of חַמָּתַי before the weak א.—The pausal forms סֹתֵר and שֹׁבֵט (out of pause always סֹתֵר, שֹׁבֵט) go back to by-forms סֹתֵר, שֹׁבֵט.—On עֹשְׁבוֹת (*constr. st. plur.* of עֹשֶׁב) Pr 27²⁵, cf. § 20 *h*; שִׁקְמִים *sycamores*, without *Qameṣ* before the termination ים—(see above, *l*), is probably from the sing. שִׁקְמָה found in the Mišna.

3. On Paradigms *c* and *f*. קִשֵּׁט occurs in Pr 22²¹ without a helping vowel; *p* with a middle guttural פָּעַל, &c., but with ה also אָהַל, בָּהֶן; with a final guttural גָּבַה, רָבַע, &c., but with א, גָּמָא; with a firmly closed syllable אָסַפִּי Mi 7¹.

Before suffixes the original *ū* sometimes reappears in the sing., e.g. גָּדְלוּ *q* (ψ 150²) beside גָּדְלוּ, from גָּדָל *greatness*; סִבְלוּ (with *Dageš forte dirimens*, and the *ū* repeated in the form of a *Ḥateph-Qameṣ*, cf. § 10 *h*) Is 9³, &c.; גִּשְׁמָה Ez 22²⁴.—Corresponding to the form פִּעְלֵכֶם *pō'ol'khēm* we find קִטְבְּךָ Ho 13¹⁴, even without a middle guttural; similarly קִטְנִי (so Jablonski and Opatius) 1 K 12¹⁰, 2 Ch 10¹⁰, from קָטַן *little finger*; but the better reading is, no doubt, קִטְנִי (so ed. Mant., 'the *q* proleptically assuming the vowel of the following syllable'; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 69), and the form is to be derived, with König, from קָטַן, not *qūtūn*, as Brockelmann quotes him, in *Grundriss*, p. 103. The reading קִטְנִי (Baer and Ginsburg) is probably not due to a confusion of the above two readings, but — is merely intended to mark the vowel expressly as *ō*. In the forms פָּעַלוּ Is 1³¹ (for פִּעְלוּ) and תָּאָרוּ Is 52¹⁴ (for תִּאָּרוּ 1 S 28¹⁴), the lengthening of the original *ū* to *ō* has been retained even before the suffix; cf. § 63 *p* and § 74 *h* בְּמִצְאָתְכֶם Gn 32²⁰).—In the same way *ō* remains before ה־ *locale*, e.g. בָּרְנָה, הָאֲהָלָה Gn 18⁶, 24⁶⁷, &c. Dissimilation of the vowel (or a by-form נָכַח?) seems to occur in נָכַחוּ Ex 14², Ez 46⁹, for נָכַחוּ.

In the *absol. st. plur.* the original *ū* generally becomes *Š^ewā* before the *Qameṣ*, *r* e.g. בִּקְרִים from בָּקָר *morning*, פְּעָלִים *works*, רִמְחִים *lances*, שְׁעָלִים *handfuls* (*constr. st.* שְׁעָלֵי Ez 13¹⁹); on the other hand, with an initial guttural the *ū*-sound reappears as *Ḥateph-Qameṣ*, e.g. חֲדָשִׁים *months*, עֲפָרִים *gazelles*, אֲרָחוֹת *ways*; and so even without an initial guttural, הַבְּרִנּוֹת *the threshing-floors*, 1 S 23¹, Jo 2²⁴; קִדְשִׁים *sanctuaries*, and שְׂרָשִׁים *roots* (*qōdhāšim*, &c., with *ō* for —); also קִדְשֵׁי [but קִדְשֵׁי, קִדְשֵׁי, once 'ק], where, however, the reading frequently fluctuates between 'ק and קִ; with the article הַ, בַּ, לַ, according to Baer and Ginsburg. On these forms cf. especially § 9 *v*. From אָהַל *tent*, both בְּאֵהָלִים and אֵהָלִים (cf. § 23 *h* and פָּעַלוּ above) are found; with light suffixes אֵהָלִי, &c.; so from אָרַח *way*, אֲרָחוֹתֵי (also אֲרָחוֹתִי)—hence only with initial א, 'on account of its weak articulation' (König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 45). It seems that by these different ways of writing a distinction was intended between the

plural of אֲרָחָה *caravan*, and of אֶרֶח *way*; however, אֲרָחוֹת is also found in the former sense (in *constr. st.* Jb 6¹⁹) and אֲרָחוֹת in the latter (e.g. Jb 13²⁷ according to the reading of Ben Naphtali and Qimḥi); cf. also אֲנִיּוֹת 2 Ch 8¹⁸ *Keth.* (אֲנִי *Q'rē*).—The *constr. st.* plural of בָּהֶן *thumb* is בְּהִנּוֹת Ju 16^f, as if from a sing. בָּהֶן: of נִגְהִי *brightness*, Is 59⁹ נִגְהוֹת (on these *qēlōl*-forms, cf. *t*).—If אֲפִנִי Pr 25¹¹ is not dual but plural (see the *Lexicon*) it is then analogous to the examples, given in *l* and *o*, of plurals without a pretonic *Qameṣ*; cf. בִּטְנִים *pistachio nuts*, probably from a sing. בִּטְנָה. According to Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii, 345 f. אֲפִנִי is a sing. (אֲפִנִי, the ground-form of אֲפִנָה, with suffix).

In the *constr. st. plur.* the only example with original *ā* is רִכְסִי ψ 31²¹; otherwise like קִדְשִׁי, אֶהְיֶה, &c.

- s* 4. Besides the forms treated hitherto we have to consider also a series of formations, which have their characteristic vowel under the *second* radical, as is ordinarily the case in Aramaic (on the origin of these forms see further, § 84^a *e*). Thus (*a*) of the form קָטַל; דְּבַשׁ *honey*, מְעַט *little*; in *pause*, דְּבַשׁ, מְעַט; נָבַר *man* (as *constr. st.*, see above, *h*), ψ 18²⁶ (elsewhere always נִבְרָה), and *infinitives* like שָׁכַב (§ 45 *c*; on קָחַת, see above, *h*); שֹׁכֵם *shoulder*, *ā* being modified to *ē* (but in *pause* שָׁכֵם); locative שְׁכָמָה, also שֹׁכָמָה Ho 6⁹. With suffixes in the usual manner שְׁכָמִי, שְׁכָבָה, Gn 19^{33.35} (an *inf.* with suffix, therefore not שְׁכָבָה). On the other hand, the *ā* is retained in the *plur. absol.* by sharpening the final consonant: אֲנָמִים (*constr.* אֲנָמִי) *marshes*, הֲרָפִים *myrtles*, מְעָטִים *few*.

- t* (*b*) Of the form קָטַל; בְּאֵר *a well*, זָאֵב *wolf*, &c.¹; locative בְּאֵרָה, with *suff.* בְּאֵרִי, *plur.* זָאֵבִים, זָאֵבִי; but בְּאֵרוֹת, *constr.* בְּאֵרוֹת; on the *inf.* *constr.* שָׁאֵת, cf. § 76 *b*.

(*c*) of the form קָטַל; בָּאֵשׁ *stench* (with *suff.* בָּאֵשׁוֹ, just as סִבְכוֹ occurs in Jer 4⁷ along with the *constr. st.* סִבְכָּה ψ 74⁵; cf. for the Dageš, § 20 *h*), perhaps also לְאֵם *nation*, pl. לְאֵמִים.

- u* 5. Paradigms *g-i* comprise the segholate forms with middle ו or י: (*a*) of the form *qāfl* with *Wāw* as a strong consonant, in which cases the original *ā* is almost always lengthened to *ā* (Paradigm *g*), thus כְּמוֹת *vanity*, עֲוֹל *iniquity*, תְּהִיךְ *midst*; with final א, שְׁוֹא *falsehood*; cf. however, also רְוַח *space*. In the *constr. st.* contraction always occurs, מוֹת, &c. (from original *maut*), and likewise before suffixes מוֹתִי, &c. Exception, עוֹל as *constr. st.* Ez 28¹⁸ (according to Qimḥi) and with *suff.* עוֹלוֹ. The contraction remains also in all cases in the plural (but see below, *w*).

- v* (*b*) Of the form *qāfl* with consonantal *Yōdh* (Paradigm *h*). With final א, גִּיא (also גִּי), in Is 40⁴ גִּיא, in the *constr. st.* (also *absol.* Zc 14⁴) גִּיא (also גִּי); plur. 2 K 2¹⁶ and Ez 6³ *Keth.* according to Baer גִּאוֹת, i. e. doubtless גִּאוֹת (cf. גִּיאוֹתֶיךָ Ez 35⁸; according to another reading [and so Ginsburg] גִּיאוֹת,

¹ The proposal of Haupt (*SBOT.* 'Proverbs', p. 34, l. 44 ff.) to read זָאֵב, בְּאֵר, &c., does not seem to be warranted. The case here is quite different from that in Pr 1²² where the Masora requires תִּאָּהָבִי, no doubt on the analogy of בְּאֵר, &c., for תִּאָּהָבִי, which was probably intended, see § 63 *m*.

צָרִי (also דָּמִי, יָפִי, צָרִי, רָאִי, &c.; in pause חָלִי, &c., with suff. חָלִי, plur. חָלִיִּים. From עָפֵי branch, there occurs in ψ 104¹² the plur. עָפָאִים (analogous to פָּתָאִים, &c., see above, x); the *K^{eth}*. evidently intends עָפָאִים (so Opatius and others). Dual, with suff. דָּלִי Nu 24⁷, bucket (from דָּלִי, for דָּלִי), more correctly, with the Masora, דָּלִי with Munah for Metheg. This unusual Metheg is to be treated as following the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 9 v.

aa 7. On Paradigms l-n: segholate forms from stems ע"ע (see § 84^a c, β).

(a) In the *qatl*-form the *ä* of the contracted formation is sometimes lengthened in the *absol. st.*, sing. as in יָם (so also in the *constr. st.*, except in the combination יָם-סוּף the Red sea; and even before *Maqqeph* יָם-הַיָּלָח the salt sea), sometimes it remains short, e.g. פֶּת מֶסֶל morsel, עַם people, but even these formations generally have *Qames* in pause, as well as after the article (e.g. הָעָם). Adjectives under the influence of a guttural either have forms like לָחִים, צָחִים or, with compensatory lengthening, רָעִי, רָעִים. In the *constr. st.* חַי living (in the plural חַיִּים also a substantive, life), and יָד sufficiency, are contracted to חַי¹ and יָד. As a locative form notice הָרָה to the mountain, Gn 14¹⁰ (see § 27 q) beside הָרָה. The stem is expanded to a trilateral form in הָרָרִי (unless it is simply derived from a by-form הָרָר on the analogy of *qätäl*-forms) Jer 17³ (but in ψ 30⁸ for הָרָרִי read הָרָרִי) and הָרָרִים Gn 14⁶; plur. *constr.* הָרָרִי Nu 23⁷, &c. (but only in poetical passages), with suffix, הָרָרִי Dt 8⁹; עֲמָמִים Ju 5¹⁴ (where, however, read probably בְּעֲמָמִי, Neh 9²²; עֲמָמִי Neh 9²⁴: elsewhere עֲמָי, עֲמִי.—Before suffixes and in the plur. *ä* is sometimes attenuated to *i*, e.g. פָּתִי, פָּתִים, from פָּת; סָפִי, סָפִים and סָפִית (also סָפִית 2 S 17²³) from סָף. Before *h ä* is retained in a virtually sharpened syllable, e.g. פָּחִים traps.

bb (b) *Qitl*-forms: אֵשׁ, אֵשׁ fire (with suff. אֵשִׁי, but cf. also אֵשְׁכֶם Is 50¹¹), חֵן favour, &c.; of a trilateral form, the plur. חֲצִצְיָד ψ 77¹⁸.

(c) *Qitl*-forms: חֵק, כֹּל totality, before *Maqqeph* חֶק, כֶּל, with suff. חֶקִּי, &c., with omission of *Dageš forte* (according to § 20 m) always חֶקֶךְ, חֶקְכֶם, but from עוֹד, עוֹד, עוֹדֶם, עוֹדֶם, for which עוֹדִי and עוֹדֶה are also found. חֶקֶךְ, expanded to a trilateral form, Ju 5¹⁵ and Is 10¹, generally explained as a secondary form of חֶקֶךְ with abnormal weakening of the *ä* to *i*, is more probably to be referred to a *qitl*-form = Arabic *hiqq*.

cc The forms with assimilated middle *Nûn* likewise follow the analogy of Paradigms l-n, e.g. אָף nose, anger (אָפִי, dual אָפִים, also face) for 'anp; חֶךְ palate for *hink*, יָקִים fetters, עֵז goat, plur. עֵזִים, for 'inz, probably also אֵב green herb, for 'inb.

dd 2. Paradigm II comprises all formations with original short vowels, whether in the first or second syllable; cf. § 84^a f-i, and the general laws of formation, § 92 b-g.

¹ חַי only in Dn 12⁷ as *constr. st.*, since in the asseverative formulae (cf. § 149) חַי נִפְשֶׁךְ, חַי נִפְשֶׁךְ (otherwise only in 2 S 15²¹, after חַי יְהוָה and Amos 8¹⁴), חַי is a contracted form of the *absol. st.* (prop. living is Pharaoh! &c.). It is evidently only a rabbinical refinement which makes the pronunciation חַי distinctive of an oath by God (or of God by himself), as in the regular formulae חַי אֱלֹהֵי (חַי אֱלֹהֵי) Dt 32⁴⁰ and חַי יְהוָה (= חַי אֱלֹהֵי).

Rem. 1. On Paradigms *a* and *b*: ground-form *qāṭāl*. The lengthening of the second *ā* to *ā* is maintained in the *constr. st. sing.* only in ל"ל-forms, e.g. צָבָא *army*, צָבָא. For the construct forms חֵלֶב *milk*, לֶבָן *white*, Gn 49¹², instead of the ordinary *absolutes* חָלֶב, לָבָן, a secondary form חֵלֶב, לָבָן must be assumed; from עָשָׁן *smoke*, the *constr. st.* עֹשָׁן occurs once, Ex 19¹⁸, beside עֵשָׁן, from הָדָר *ornament* the *constr. st.* הֵדָר Dn 11²⁰, beside the common form הָדָר.—The plur. פָּרָשִׁים *horses*, Is 21⁷ (instead of פְּרָשִׁים, ground-form *pārāš*) is no doubt due to a confusion with the *qāṭāl*-form פָּרָשׁ *horseman*.

A. Sometimes a sharpening of the third radical takes place, in order to *ee* keep the preceding vowel short, e.g. פְּלִנֹת *small ones*, קְטַנִּים *small ones*, פְּלִנֹת *brooks* (see § 20 *a*).—The attenuation of the *ā* of the first syllable to *i* does not take place in the *constr. st. plur.* as a rule after an initial guttural, as חֲכָמִי, but חֲכָמִי, and never before a middle guttural, e.g. נְהַרִי; nor (according to König, owing to the influence of the nasal) in the non-guttural forms וְנָבוֹת *tails*, בְּנִפּוֹת, and (in the dual) בְּנָפִי *wings*, from זָבָה, זָבָה.—The dual נְהַרִים from נָהָר *river*, shows an abnormal omission of the lengthening of the *ā* before a tone-bearing termination, but cf. § 88 *c*.

B. From ע"ע stems, forms like חָלָל, עָנָן, &c., belong to this class.

C. The few nouns of the ground-form *qāṭāl* follow the same analogy, such as לֵבָב *heart*, שָׁכָר *strong drink*, עֵנָב *grape*, &c. From שָׁעַר *hair*, in the *constr. st.* besides שָׁעַר the form שֵׁעַר is also found (perhaps a survival of a secondary form like those in Paradigm I, *d*); so from צֶלַע *rib*, צֶלַע and even צֶלַע 2 S 16¹³ (so ed. Mant., Ginsb.; but Baer צֶלַע), both, probably, old secondary forms (also used for the *absol. st.*) of צֶלַע; cf. also צֶלַע and צֶלַע, as well as the *constr. st. plur.* צֶלַעֹת; also from נֶכֶד *strangeness*, the *constr. st.* נֶכֶדֶר is found, Dt 31¹⁶.

2. On Paradigms *c-e*: ground-form *qāṭāl*, developed to *qāṭāl*; with a final guttural, e.g. שָׂבַע *satisfied*. In the *constr. st.* the original *i* of the second syllable, probably on the analogy of the forms discussed in § 69 *c*, becomes *ā*, e.g. זֶקֶן, חֶסֶד, &c., but not before suffixes, בְּחֶפְזִי, &c., nor in forms from ל"ל stems, e.g. מָלֵא *full*, מָלֵא; cf., moreover, עָקָב Gn 25²⁶ from עָקָב *heel*, and אֲבֵלֶּה ψ 35¹⁴, *mourning*. Paradigm *d* represents forms which in the *constr. st.* instead of the ordinary בְּתָה, &c., have a segholate form, as אֲרָה, אֲרָה, אֲרָה, אֲרָה, אֲרָה (Ez 44⁹), *constr. st.* of אֲרָה *long*, אֲרָה *wall*, אֲרָה *thigh*, אֲרָה *robbery*, אֲרָה *uncircumcised*. In Is 11¹⁴ בְּבִתְהָ would be altogether without precedent as a *constr. st.* (for בְּבִתְהָ); most probably the *absol. st.* is intended by the Masora (according to Nöldeke, Gött. Gel. Anzeigen, 1871, No. 23 [p. 896] for אֲחָד *בב' with one shoulder*, i.e. *shoulder to shoulder*); [cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 190, *Obs.*].

In the *plur. constr.* the *ē* lengthened from *i* is frequently retained in verbal *ii* adjectives of this formation, e.g. חֲפָצִי, יִשְׁנִי, אֲבֵלִי, שְׂמֵחִי, שְׂבָחִי; cf. also יְחֻדָּתִי (with *ē* under the protection of the secondary tone) from יָחַד *tent-peg*. On the other hand from יָרָא *fearing*, always יָרָא; cf. also רִנְעִי ψ 35²⁰ from רָנַע.—With *ā* retained in the initial syllable cf. אֲחָר *alius* (with a virtual sharpening of the ח).—From ע"י stems come forms like מֵת *dead person*, גֵּר *resident stranger*, עֵד *witness*, with unchangeable *Sērē*; hence מֵתִי, מֵתִי, &c.

Kindred in character are the formations from the ground-form *qāṭāl*. This *kk*

ground-form is regularly lengthened to *qāṭōl*, e.g. עֵזֶל *round*, עֵמֶק *deep*, אֶדָם *red*; but before formative additions the short *ū* returns, protected by the sharpening of the following consonant (see *ee* above), as עֵזֶלִים, &c. (but in stems with a third guttural or ר, גִּבְהָה, שְׁחָרִים). The form עֵזֶל, 1 K 10¹⁹, is abnormal; likewise עֵמֶקָה Pr 23²⁷, Jablonski (ed. Mant. עֵמֶקָה, Baer and Ginsburg עֵמֶקָה).

ll 3. On Paradigm *f*: ground-form *qāṭāl* from ל"ה stems. As in verbs ל"ה § 75 *h*, the general rule is that before the terminations of the plur. and dual and before suffixes beginning with a vowel, the third radical is usually elided altogether. But besides שָׁרָה the form שָׁרִי, with the final *Yōdh* retained, is also found in poetry (cf. also the singulars with suffixes, like מִשְׁתִּיהֶם, in *ss*); in the same way final *l* is retained in עֲנִיִּים *the poor*, constr. עֲנִי. The plur. of שָׁרָה is שָׁרוֹת, constr. שָׁרוֹת (also שָׁרִי, unless this is a *sing.*, contracted from שָׁרִי; so Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii, p. 351). The *qāṭāl*-form (see § 84^a *i*) רָעָה 2 S 15⁸⁷, 16¹⁶, 1 K 4⁵ is remarkable as a *constr. st.* (the reading רָעָה of Opitius and others is opposed to the express statement of the Masora). To the category of these forms also belongs without doubt פָּנִים *face* (only in *plur.*), פָּנִי, פָּנֶיךָ, &c.

mm In a few formations of this kind the vowel of the second syllable appears to have been already lost in the *absol. st. sing.*; so according to the ordinary view, in יָד *hand*, constr. יָד, with suff. יָדוֹ, but יָדְכֶם; plur. יָדוֹת, constr. יָדוֹת, dual יָדַי, with suff. יָדֶיךָ, &c., and in דָּם *blood*, constr. דָּם, with suff. דָּמִי, but דָּמְכֶם (*ā* attenuated to *i*), plur. דָּמִים, דָּמִי. But perhaps both these nouns are to be regarded as primitive (§ 81), and as original monosyllabic formations.

nn 3. Paradigm III comprises forms with an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable, whilst the vowel of the second syllable has been lengthened from an original short vowel, and is therefore changeable. The special cases are to be distinguished in which the original short vowel is lengthened both *in* and *before* the tone, but in an open syllable becomes *Š^ewā* (Paradigm *a*, but cf. also examples like אוֹפְנִים *wheels*, for אוֹפְנִים, and אֶלְמִים *porches*), secondly, the cases in which the vowel becomes *Š^ewā* even *before* the tone (Paradigm *b*), and finally, those in which the termination of ל"ה formations is entirely lost (Paradigm *c*).

oo Rem. 1. On the model of עֹלָם (which, moreover, is obscured from 'ālām), the following forms also are inflected: מִקְטָל (§ 85 *h*), in some cases with virtual sharpening of the third radical (see § 20 *a*), as מִבְּטָחוֹ Jer 17⁷, ψ 40⁵, Jb 8¹⁴, &c.; ל"א nouns of this form maintain the *Qameṣ* in the *constr. st. plur.*, e.g. מִקְרָאִי from מִקְרָא¹; on the other hand, in the plur. of the *participles Niph.* (§ 85 *n*) of verbs ל"א (which likewise belong to this class), are found not only regular forms like נִקְרָאִים but also נִחְבָּאִים Jos 10¹⁷, נִטְמָאִים Ez 20^{30f.},

¹ מִקְרָשִׁיהֶם Ez 7²⁴ for מִקְרָשׁ (from מִקְרָשׁ) is wholly irregular; perhaps, however, the *part. Pi'el* is intended, without *Dageṣ* in the ק (according to § 20 *m*).

and so always נִבְּאִים (except Ez 13² הַנִּבְּאִים) and נִמְצְאִים 1 S 13¹⁵, 2 K 14¹⁴, &c. (except Ezr 8²⁵ הַנִּמְצְאִים in pause).¹

Moreover, the other participles in *ā* also follow the analogy of עֹלָם as *pp* regards the final syllable (מִקְטָל, מִקְטָל; cf., however, הַמּוֹשֵׁב Gn 43¹² in close connexion; see the analogous cases in § 65 *d*); also שֹׁלְחָן *table* (§ 85 *u*; plur. שֹׁלְחָנוֹת, *constr.* שֹׁלְחָנוֹת, קָרְבָן, *constr.* קָרְבָן, hence in plur. *constr.* with *suff.* קָרְבָּנֵיהֶם Lv 7³⁸; עֶקְרֵב (§ 85 *w*), plur. עֶקְרֵבִים (with sharpening of the final consonant for עֶקְרֵבִים, cf. also עֵרִים *naked*, plur. עֵרִימִם Gn 3⁷ [but in 2²⁵ מַעֲרָמִים, according to § 90 an orthographic licence for עֵרִימִים from עֵרִים], nakedness, 2 Ch 28¹⁵; מְרַדְּמוֹ, מְרַדְּמֵי Is 51¹⁰; נִכְבְּדֵי Is 23^{8 f.}; מִשְׁנֵי 1 S 18³; even with attenuation of the *ā* to *i*, מוֹרְגִים *threshing instruments*, 2 S 24²², 1 Ch 21²³, from מוֹרֵג, מֵתָן (§ 85 *g*), מִנֵּן (§ 85 *i*), מַעֲזֵי (§ 85 *k*), inasmuch as they retain the *ā* of the first syllable, contrary to rule, even when not pretonic, e.g. מִנֵּנִי, מַעֲזֵי, מִנְשֵׁב (§ 85 *g*); הוֹשֵׁב (§ 85 *p*), *constr. st. plur.* הַשֹּׁבֵי 1 K 17¹; also isolated forms according to § 84^a *t*, and § 84^b *b, c, k, m, n, o*. Cf. finally, צִנָּאר *neck* (from *sāw'ār*), *constr. st.* צִנָּאר Jer 28^{10 ff.}, *constr. st. plur.* צִנָּאֵי Gn 45¹⁴, &c.

2. (Paradigm *b*; cf. § 84^a *s*.) Instead of the original *i* in such forms as *qq* אֵיבֶכֶם (cf. 2 K 22²⁹), the second syllable more frequently has *ē*, e.g. יֹצֵרֶךָ *thy creator*; with a closing guttural (according to § 91 *d*; but cf. also אֶבֶר Dt 32²⁸) forms are found sometimes like שֹׁלְחֶךָ, sometimes like בִּרְאֶיךָ; *constr. st.* without *suff.* נָטַע ψ 94⁹ (according to § 65 *d*); with a middle guttural נֶאֱלֶךְ Is 48¹⁷; cf. 43¹⁴.—The same analogy also is followed in the flexion of the other participles which have *ē* in the final syllable (מִקְטָל, מִתְקַטֵּל, &c.), see further, in § 84^b *d*, נָבִין, &c. (but with exceptions, as שֹׁלְשִׁים, רִבְעִים), and *ibid.* *l, p*; § 85 *i, k* (מִזְבֵּחַ *altar*, *constr. st.* מִזְבֵּחַ, plur. מִזְבְּחוֹת), and *ibid.* *q*, but here also there are exceptions like מִקְהֵלִים ψ 26¹².

3. (Paradigm *c*: *part. Qal* of verbs לָה, differing from Paradigm II, *f* in the *rr* unchangeableness of the vowel of the first syllable.) In Ez 17¹⁵ *ē* in the *absol. st.* is abnormal, and *Sēghōl* in the *constr. st.* in 2 S 24¹¹ (so Opatius, Ginsburg; but Baer הוֹה), Ec 2¹⁵ (according to Baer, but not the Mantua ed.; מִקְרָה Ec 3¹⁰ is in the *absol. st.*). To this class belong, as regards their formation, the לָה-forms mentioned in § 84^a *r*, § 85 *g* (with *suff.*, e.g. הַמַּעֲלֶךְ Dt 20¹, *which brought thee up*), and *h*.

In a few instances, before a suffix beginning with a consonant, the original *ss* *ay* of the termination has been contracted to *ē*, and thus there arise forms which have apparently *plural suffixes*; as מִשְׁתֵּיהֶם Is 5¹², Dn 1^{10.16}; מֵרֵאיהֶם *their appearance*, Dn 1¹⁵, Gn 41²¹, cf. Na 2⁵; נִמְיָהֶם *who stretched them forth*, Is 42⁵; defectively אִפְהֶם Ho 7⁵ (cf. נִוְהֶם Ez 34¹⁴); on the other hand, the examples in Is 14¹¹, Gn 47¹⁷, which were formerly classed with the above, are really plurals. But מַחֲנֶיךָ *thy camp*, Dt 23¹⁵ (מַחֲנֶךָ occurs just before),

¹ Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, p. 659, observes that except in 2 Ch 5¹¹, 35¹⁷ הַנִּמְצְאִים is always followed by a preposition governing a word, so that the punctuators perhaps intended to indicate a sort of *constr. st.*

מִרְאֵי *thy cattle*, Is 30²³ (probably also שְׂרִידֵי 1 K 2²⁶), מִרְאֵי Ct 2¹⁴, and מִרְאֵי *the sight of him*, Jb 41¹ (with the *i* here retained orthographically), מִרְאֵי Ez 40³¹, &c., are still to be explained as singulars.—On a few other examples which may perhaps be thus explained, see § 124 *k*. Before the plural ending the original termination *ay* reappears in מִרְאֵי Is 25⁶ (*part. Pu.* from מִרְאֵי).

tt 4. Paradigm IV comprises the forms with a changeable vowel (*a, b*), or a vowel which has already become *Šewā* (*c*), in the first syllable, and an unchangeable vowel in the second. With Paradigm *c* (which, however, for the most part consists merely of forms based on analogy, without biblical parallels) are also connected all the forms which have unchangeable vowels in both syllables, and therefore (like פֶּתַח) cannot undergo any vowel changes.

uu Rem. 1. Analogous to פָּקִיד (ground-form *pāqīd*) are § 84^a *k*, נָדוּל, &c. (with *ô*, not changeable *ô* for *ü*); in substantives like שָׁלוֹם, this *ô* is demonstrably obscured from *â* (Arab. *sālām*); *ibid.* *l, m*, אָסִיר, אָסִיר, &c.; § 85 *u*, וְכָרוּ, *constr.* וְכָרוּ; חָיוּן, *constr.* חָיוּן; בָּלִיּוֹן, *constr.* בָּלִיּוֹן (cf., however, the forms in the *constr. st.* עֲצָבוֹן, קִנְמוֹן, and with the plural suffix עֲבוּרֵיךְ Ez 27¹² *u*); § 85 *w*, חֲלָמִישׁ, *constr.* חֲלָמִישׁ; § 85 *l*, מָקוֹם, &c.

uu 2. עָנִי (ground-form *ʾānīy*, stem עָנָה) represents forms in which a final *Yōdh* has been resolved into *i*; before formative additions the original *Yōdh* under the protection of a *Dageš forte* again becomes audible as a firm consonant, whilst the (originally short) vowel of the first syllable becomes *Šewā*; cf. § 84^a *l*, נָקִי, plur. נְקִיִּים, and § 87 *a*.

ww 3. פֶּתַח with unchangeable *â* in the second syllable, whilst the *Šewā* is weakened from a short vowel (Arab. *kitāb*); *constr. st.* פֶּתַח Est 4⁸ (readings like פֶּתַח 2 Ch 35⁴ are incorrect, although יָקָר Est 1⁴ and פֶּתַח 4⁸ are supported by fairly good authority; however, these *qetāl*-forms in Hebrew are probably all loan-words from the Aramaic). The only plural form found in the O. T. is עֲבֹדָתָם *their deeds*, Ec 9¹. In a narrower sense the forms enumerated in § 84^a *n-p* belong to this class; in a wider sense all those which have unchangeable vowels throughout, thus § 84^a *u*, § 84^b *e* (קָטַל, cf., however, the anomalous forms mentioned there), *ibid.* *f-i, m* (No. 34 *f.*), *n* (No. 39), *p* (No. 44), also partly § 85 *b-w* (especially *l* and *r*).

xx In opposition to the anomalous shortening of the form קָטַל (see above), cases are also found where pretonic vowels are retained even in the antepenultima (with the secondary tone); cf. above, *ii* and *pp*, also of the form קָטַל (properly *qātūl*) the examples סְרִיסִים, פְּרִיצִים, שְׁלִישִׁים, whilst the *constr. st. sing.* according to the rule, changes the *ā* into *Šewā* (סְרִיס, פְּרִיץ, שְׁלִישׁ). (These are not to be confounded with forms like עֲרִיץ *tyrant*, which is for עָרִיץ, and consequently has an unchangeable *Qameš*.) Of the form קָטַל (*qātūl*) in this class are שָׁבַע *week*, plur. שָׁבָעִים, *constr.* שָׁבָעוֹת, but with *Metheg* of the secondary tone in the fifth syllable from the end, שָׁבָעוֹתָם.—On מְעוֹץ, &c., cf. § 85 *k*.

§ 94. Formation of Feminine Nouns.

1. The feminine ending הַ- , when appended to the masculine *a* forms treated in § 93, effects in almost all cases the same changes as are produced in the masculine forms by the addition of a light suffix, since in both cases the tone is moved one place farther forward (see § 92 *b*). The following scheme is based on the same division into four classes, with their subdivisions, as in § 93; a few special forms will be treated in § 95 in connexion with the paradigms of feminine nouns.

Paradigm I: segholate forms, with the feminine ending always *b* added to the ground-form, (*a*) מַלְכָּה *queen*, בַּבְשָׁה, and with attenuation of *ā* to *i* בַּבְשָׁה *lamb*, רֹצֶפֶה *hot stone*, Is 6⁶ (elsewhere always רֹצֶפֶה; see Baer on Ez 40¹⁷), חֲזָקָה *strength* (unless belonging to Paradigm *b*); (*b*) סִתְרָה *covering* (masc. סִתֵּר); עֲרֵנָה *pleasure* (עֵרֶן), not to be confounded with the unchangeable forms with a prefixed מ, derived from ל"ה stems, as מִצְוָה *command*, plur. מִצְוֹת; (*c*) חִלְדָּה, proper name (חֵלֶד *mole*), אֲכָלָה *food* (אָכַל); (*d*) נַעֲרָה *girl* (נָעַר); (*f*) בָּאֵשָׁה *weed*, טְהִירָה *purity* (טָהַר); (*g*) עוֹלָה *wrong* (also עוֹלָה, Paradigm *i*); (*i*) צִידָה *victuals* (masc. צִיד, cf. Paradigm *h*); from *qīl* and *qūtl*-forms, בִּינָה *understanding*, סוּפָה *tempest*; (*k*) אֵלִיָּה *fat tail* (as if from אָלַי), שְׁבִיָּה (*ā* attenuated to *i*) *captivity* (שָׁבַי), לוֹיָה *wreath* (probably an original *qītl*-form); (*l*) חַיָּה *life*, מִדָּה *measure* (attenuated from מָדָה). Adjectives derived from ע"ע stems also belong in flexion to this class, as רַבָּה *multa*, with middle guttural רָצָה *mala*; (*m*) וְפָה *plan*; (*n*) חֲקָה *statute* (חָק).

Paradigm II: ground-form *qātālāt*, &c., (*a*) נִקְמָה *vengeance* (נָקַם); *c* (*b*) אֲרָמָה *earth*; (*c*) נִבְלָה *corpse*; (*d*) עֵיפָה *languida*; (*f*) יָפָה *beautiful*, קֶצֶה *end* (from יָפָה, קָצָה). From stems ע"י arise such forms as יָעָה (masc. יָעַר, properly *part.* *Qal* from יָעַר) *female witness*. From the ground-form *qātūl*, עֲמֻקָּה *profunda* (masc. עָמַק), עֲבָדָה *servitude*, &c.

Paradigm III: unchangeable vowel in the first, changeable in the *d* second syllable, (*a*) יִלְדָּה *a woman with child* (cf. the examples in § 84^a *s*, and the retention of the *ē* in the *part.* *Pi'ēl*, Ex 22¹⁷, 23²⁶; in the *Hithpa'ēl* 1 K 14^{5f.}), but also with the change of the *ē* (originally *i*) into Š^ewā, יִשְׁבָּה *dwelling*, Na 3⁸. However, in these participial forms the feminine is mostly indicated by תַּ- (see below, *h*); (*c*) גּוֹלָה *those of the captivity* (masc. גּוֹלָה), but also with a return of the final *Yôdh*, הִמְיָה *clamorous*, Pr 7¹¹, and the examples in § 75 *v*. On the *d* of the participles of verbs ע"י, which also belong to this class, such as יָרָה *peregrina*, cf. § 72 *g*.

e Paradigm IV: originally changeable vowel in the first syllable, unchangeable in the second, (a) גְּדֹלָה *magna*, חֲסִידָה *stork*, properly *pia*; בְּתוּלָה *virgin*, properly *seivuncta*; (b) עֲנִיָּה *miseria*.

f 2. A simple ת is added as feminine ending in forms like בְּכִית *weeping* (masc. בָּכִי, § 93 *a*, a), בְּרִית *covenant*; but *feminine participles* of verbs ל"א, as יֵצֵאת, מֵצֵאת, may be due to contraction from *yôse'et*, &c. (hardly to lengthening of the *i* in the ground-form *môsi*), whilst forms like מוֹצֵאת, נִשְׁמָת (see § 74 *i*) are to be explained on the analogy of the forms treated in § 93 *t*. Apart from the ל"ה formations, we find the simple ת in the participle מְשַׁרְת 1 K 1¹⁵, contracted from מְשַׁרְתָּה. But וְלִדְתָּה Gn 16¹¹, Ju 13^{5.7} is the ground-form of the ptep. וְלִדְתָּה (as in the same connexion in Gn 17¹⁹, Is 7¹⁴), cf. § 80 *d* and the *Qere* שְׁבַתָּה, &c., discussed in § 90 *n*.

g The forms which arise by appending the ת feminine to masculine nouns with a changeable vowel in a closed final syllable are, as a rule, developed exactly in the same way as masculine segholate forms. Thus there arise in Paradigm I (a) from גְּבִירָה (for original *g^ebirt*; § 69 *c*), the form גְּבִירָת *mistress* (but only in *construct st.*; in Is 47⁷ also עַר גְּבִירָת are to be taken together; the *absolute st.* is גְּבִירָה); from מַלְכָּה *queen* (in Paradigm II, *a*); פֶּחָתָה (פֶּחַת = פֶּחַת *pît*) Lv 13⁵⁵; (c) גִּירָה *wall*, גִּירָת (from גִּירָה = *g^edirt*; cf. וְלִן as *construct st.* of וְלִן); on the other hand, חֲמִשָּׁה is *construct st.* of חֲמִשָּׁה *five*, with lengthening of the original *i* of חֲמִשָּׁה.

h Formations with a changeable *ô* in the second syllable belonging to this class are נְחֹשֶׁת *bronze* (from נְחֹשֶׁת), כֹּהֶנֶת the *constr. st.* of כֹּהֶנֶת *coat*, perhaps also כְּתָבָה *writing* (unless it be obscured from כְּתָבָה, § 93, Paradigm IV, *c*).—Paradigm III, (a) חֲתָמָה (from חֲתָמָה), masc. חֲתָם *seal*; (b) יוֹנְקָה (properly *sucking*) *sprout* (in *pause*, e.g. חֲנֻכָּה Ex 26⁴, &c.), and so most feminines of participles קָטַל. On this transition of the ground-form *qôtilt* to קָטַלָּה (regularly before suffixes in יוֹנְקָה, יוֹלְדָה, &c.), cf. § 69 *c*; *qôtilt* serves as the ground-form under the influence of a guttural as well as before suffixes, e.g. יֹדְעָה, feminine of יָדַע *knowing*; in a wider sense, גִּלְגָּלָה *skull* may also be included here, see § 95, Paradigm IV, *c*.

On the endings ית and ית—, see § 86 *k*, *l*, § 95 at the end.

§ 95. Paradigms of Feminine Nouns.

a In accordance with the general formative laws, stated in § 92 *b-k*, the following cases have chiefly to be considered in the flexion of

feminines also: (1) a tone-lengthened vowel on the removal of the tone reverts to its original shortness (thus the \bar{a} of the termination η_{-} becomes again \check{a} in the *construct st.* η_{-}). On the other hand, even an originally short vowel is retained as (a long) pretonic vowel before the endings η_{-} and η in the *abs. st.*, e. g. צִדְקָה ; (2) without the tone or foretone an originally short vowel almost always becomes $\check{S}ew\check{a}$; on the other hand, before a vowel which had thus become $\check{S}ew\check{a}$ the \check{a} in the first syllable which had hitherto also been reduced to $\check{S}ew\check{a}$ returns, although usually attenuated to \check{z} , e. g. צִדְקָה from $\check{s}\check{a}d\check{h}\check{a}q\check{a}th$; (3) in the plural of the feminines of segholate forms before the termination of η or η_{-} , and in formations of the latter kind also before the light suffixes, a *pretonic Qames* reappears, while the short vowel of the first syllable becomes $\check{S}ew\check{a}$. This short vowel, however, returns in the *construct st. plur.*, whether ending in η or η_{-} ; in formations of the latter kind also before the grave suffixes.

The following Paradigms (with the exception of I, *d*) deal only with such of the forms treated in § 94 as incur some vowel changes or other. All forms with unchangeable vowels follow the analogy of Paradigm I, *d*.

I.					
	a.	b.		c.	d. e.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	מְלִכָּה (queen)	[כְּלִיָּה] (kidney)	חֲרָפָה (reproach)	חֲרָבָה (waste)	חֲקָה [חֲבִירָה] (statute) (mistress)
„ <i>construct</i>	מְלִכַת		חֲרַפַת	חֲרַבַת	חֲקַת גְּבִירַת
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	מְלִכָּתִי		חֲרַפָּתִי	חֲרַבָּתִי	חֲקָתִי גְּבִירָתִי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	מְלִכַתְכֶּם		חֲרַפַתְכֶּם	חֲרַבַתְכֶּם	חֲקַתְכֶּם גְּבִירַתְכֶּם
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מְלָכוֹת	כְּלִיּוֹת	חֲרָפוֹת	חֲרָבוֹת	חֲקוֹת
„ <i>construct</i>	מְלָכוֹת	כְּלִיּוֹת	חֲרָפוֹת ¹	חֲרָבוֹת	חֲקוֹת
„ <i>with suff.</i>	מְלָכוֹתִי	כְּלִיּוֹתִי		חֲרָבוֹתִי	חֲקוֹתִי
<i>Dual absolute</i>		רִקְמָתַיִם (a double piece of embroidery)			מִצְבָּלָתַיִם (cymbals)

¹ Only in ψ 69¹⁰, contrary to rule, with a firmly closed syllable, cf. § 93 m.

	II.			III.	
	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	צְדָקָה (righteousness)	זַעֲקָה (outcry)	שָׁנָה (year)	יוֹנָקָה (sprout)	גִּלְגָּלֶת (skull)
„ <i>construct</i>	צִדְקַת	זַעֲקַת	שָׁנַת	יוֹנָקַת	גִּלְגָּלַת
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	צִדְקָתִי	זַעֲקָתִי	שָׁנָתִי	יוֹנָקָתִי	גִּלְגָּלַתִּי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	צִדְקַתְכֶם	זַעֲקַתְכֶם	שָׁנַתְכֶם	יוֹנָקַתְכֶם	גִּלְגָּלַתְכֶם
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	צִדְקוֹת		שָׁנוֹת ¹	[יוֹנָקוֹת]	
„ <i>construct</i>	צִדְקוֹת		שָׁנוֹת	יוֹנָקוֹת	גִּלְגָּלוֹת
„ <i>with suff.</i>	צִדְקוֹתִי		שָׁנוֹתִי	יוֹנָקוֹתִי	גִּלְגָּלוֹתִי
<i>Dual absolute</i>	[נְחֻשְׁתַּיִם] (fettlers of brass)		שִׁפְתָיִם (lips)		
„ <i>construct</i>			שִׁפְתָי		

REMARKS.

d 1. Paradigm I: feminines of segholate forms. (a) The locative of this class has the form גִּבְעָתָהּ towards Gibeah (masc. גִּבְעָה). In some cases, especially with an initial guttural, there is no means of deciding whether the form in question is to be referred to a *qātl* or a *qītl* base, e.g. חֲזָקָה strength (cf. חֲרָפָה under b). A dual of this form occurs in שִׁבְעָתַיִם seven times (cf. שִׁבְעָה seven, fem.). Analogous to masculine forms like דְּבִשׁ (§ 93 s) is הֲדַסָּה myrtle.—From masculines of the form פָּרִי (ל"ה, cf. § 93 I, k) arise feminines sometimes like נֶאֱוָה, שְׁלֹוָה, אֱלִיָּה (see above, § 94 b), sometimes like בְּכִית (§ 94 f); occasionally the final ה is retained before the plural ending, as if it belonged to the stem (cf. § 87 k), e.g. חֲנִיתוֹת spears. Forms like גִּדְיָה (cf. אֲנִיָּה, a *qūtl* form) are derived directly from the masculine forms גִּדִּי kid, אֲנִי a fleet.—(b) From a stem עֵן wheat (for חֲנָה), plur. חֲנָתִים.—(c) From עֶרְלָה foreskin, the plur. absol. is עֶרְלוֹת (cf. פְּעֻלִּים, § 93, Paradigm I, f), constr. עֶרְלוֹת.—(d) Example of a feminine segholate form from a stem ע"ע (ground-form *qūtl*), like חִיָּה of the form *qātl*, וִזְמָה of the form *qītl*), with ö for ü, חֲנָא terror, Is 19¹⁷ (Aramaic orthography for חֲנָה).

e (e) To the list of segholate forms with ת fem. belong also the infinitives of verbs פ"ו and פ"ן, which have rejected the weak consonant at the beginning, as שָׁבַח (from יִשָּׁב), יָדַע (from יִדַּע), נָשַׁח (from נִשָּׁח), as well as קָחַת (from לָקַח); cf. § 69 m and § 66 b and g. The infinitives of verbs פ"ו are, however, also found in the form יָדַע, לָדַח, צָאָה, and of the same origin also are עֲדָה congregation (from יָדַע), עֲצָה counsel (from יָעַן), שָׁנָה sleep (from יָשָׁן), constr. עֲדַת, שָׁנַת, while in the constr. forms זַעַת sweat, Gn 3¹⁹ (from יָעַע to flow), and צָאָה excrement, Ez 4¹³, the *Şere* has remained firm.

f From a stem ע"י (cf. בּוֹשׁ to be ashamed) is בִּשְׁתָּה shame, with suffix בִּשְׁתִּי.

¹ On שָׁנוֹת as a less frequent (poetic) form for שָׁנִים see § 87 n.

From a stem ל"ה (דָּלָה, cf., however, Barth, *ZDMG.* 1887, p. 607, who assumes a stem ידל) the masculine דָּל appears to have been formed after the rejection of the final *Fōdh*, and afterwards the feminine דָּלָה *door*; but in the plural דָּלָתוֹת, constr. דָּלָתוֹת, the ת of the termination is retained (see above, d, חֲנִיתוֹת). In a similar way רָפְתִּים *stalls*, Hb 3¹⁷, has arisen, if it is from the stem רפה, and נִשְׁקָה *trough* (from נִשְׁקָה), of which the masc. must have been נִשְׁקָ = נִשְׁקִי; on the other hand, the plur. constr. נִשְׁקָתוֹת Gn 3c³⁸ (again retaining the feminine ת as an apparent radical) can only be an abnormal formation from the singular נִשְׁקָה, not from a kindred form נִשְׁקָה or נִשְׁקָה.

2. Paradigm II: ground-form *qāṭālūt*, &c., cf. § 94 c, Paradigm II, a and b. ^g Analogous to the masculine forms like קָטַן, plur. קָטָנִים, we find קָטְנָה *parva*, &c.—The constr. forms, like צָרְקָה (*sidh^g qāth*), are distinguished by the vocal *Ṣewā* (§ 10 d) from the segholate forms, like כִּבְשָׁת (*kibh-sāth*). Consequently the constr. st. בְּרִכָּה Gn 28⁴, &c. (from בָּרַךְ *blessing*), and חֲרִדָּה 1 S 14¹⁵, &c. (from חָרַד *a trembling*), are abnormal.—Under the influence of a guttural (see Paradigm b) the original *ā* is retained in the first syllable in the constr. st. (cf. also אֲרָמָה *earth*, אֲדָמָה); in other cases it is modified to *S^ghōl*, e.g. עֲנָלָה *wagon*, עֲנָלָה. Frequently from an absol. st. in ה— the constr. is formed with the termination ת, e.g. עֲטָרָה *crown*, constr. עֲטָרָת (from עָטַר); along with עֲצָרָה *assembly*, עֲצָרָת is found usually, even in the absol. st.; יָבֵמֶת (from יָבֵם *levir*) before suffixes is pointed as in יָבֵמֶתִי, and thus entirely agrees with נִבְרָת (Paradigm I e). From a stem ל"ן (אָמַן) is formed אֱמָת *truth* (from 'āmant, and this no doubt for an original 'āmint, § 69 c) before suffixes אֱמָתִי, &c.

From the masc. form קָטַל (*qāṭil*) are formed, according to rule, נִוְרָה *wall*, ^h נִבְלָה *corpse*, constr. נִבְלָת; בָּהֶמָה *cattle*, constr. בָּהֶמֶת (for בָּהֶמֶת), with suffix בָּהֶמֶתִּי Lv 19¹⁹. More frequently, however, the *ē* of the second syllable is retained before the termination *ath* of the constr. st.; thus from נִבְלָה once נִבְלָתִי Is 26¹⁹, and always בְּרִכָּה *pool*, נִוּלָת *prey*, טִמְאָה *unclean*, מְלֵאָה *full*, Is 1²¹ (with *Hireq compaginis*, see § 90 l), מְרָרָה Jb 16¹³; שְׂאֵלָה 1 S 1²⁷, &c. (with elision of the א, שְׂלָלָה 1 S 1¹⁷), also נִשְׁאֵלָה Jb 6⁸. Cf. the analogous forms of the constr. st. מִגַּפָּה *plague*, תְּרִדָּמָה *deep sleep*, from מִגַּפָּה, תְּרִדָּמָה.

As dual we find יָרֵכְתִּים *sides* (cf. יָרֵכְתוֹ Gn 49¹³, from the obsolete יָרֵכָה, ⁱ feminine of יָרֵךְ); the constr. st. יָרֵכְתִי is perhaps to be referred to a segholate form (יָרֵכָה, cf. יָרֵךְ as constr. st. of יָרֵךְ), unless the closed syllable be due to the analogy of בְּרִכָּה and חֲרִדָּה (see g).

In the forms with simple ת feminine the ground-form *qāṭilt* is developed ^k (§ 69 c) to *q^eṭalt*, and this again regularly to קָטַלָּת. Thus the feminine of חֶבֶר *companion* is חֶבְרָת (with suffix חֶבְרָתִי Mal 2¹⁴, cf. שְׂכֻנָּתָה Ex 3²²), of נֶגֶד fem. נֶגְדָּת besides נֶגְדָה.—Of ע"י stems the segholate forms נַחַת *rest* and שָׁחַת *pit* (from נָחַת, נִשְׁחָ, שָׁחַת) belong to this class; Böttcher (*Gram.* i. 411) rightly distinguished the latter from שָׁחַת *corruption* (stem שָׁחַת); in the same way also נַחַת *rest* is distinct from נַחַת *a lighting down* (stem נָחַת).

The feminines of the form *qāṭil* from stems ע"י, as מֵתָה *mortua*, עָרָה fem. ^l

witness (from מוֹת, עֵיד), have likewise an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable. Cf., on the other hand, the forms from ו"ם stems mentioned above, under *e*, such as שָׁנָה *sleep*, constr. st. שָׁנָה; moreover, חָמָה *anger*, constr. st. חָמָה (but חָמָה a leathern bottle, in pause חָמָה [so Baer, Ginsb., but Kittel חָמָה] Gn 21¹⁵, constr. st. מַיִם חָמָה Gn 21¹⁴, perhaps from a stem חָמָה).

m The feminines of the form *qātūl*, like עֲמָקָה (masc. עֲמָק), maintain the original *ū* by sharpening the following consonant (cf. § 93 *kk*); on the other hand, by appending the fem. ת, segholate forms arise like נִחְשֵׁת, before suff.

נִחְשֵׁת, &c. Dual נִחְשֵׁתַיִם (see Paradigm II, *a*); but cf. נִחְשֵׁתַי La 3⁷.

n A few (aramaising) feminines from ל"ה stems (Paradigm II, *c*) are found with the ending *āth*, due to the rejection of the final *Wāw* or *Yōdh* and contraction of the preceding *ā* with the *ā* of the termination *āth*; thus מִנְתָּה *portion* (for *mānāyāth* or *mānāwāth*), קֶצֶת *end* (also קֶצֶה and קֶצֶה), plur. מִנְתּוֹת (constr. st. Neh 12⁴⁷, 13¹⁰) and מִנְתּוֹת (Neh 12⁴⁴); קֶצֶת *Ex* 38⁵; cf. 37⁸ and 39⁴ *Keth.*; on גִּלְתָּה *valleys*, see § 93 *v*.—אוֹת *sign* (stem אוֹה) is obscured from אָת, and this is contracted from 'āyāth = 'āvāyāth; plur. אוֹתוֹת, with the double feminine ending; cf. above, *f*, and § 87 *k*.—The retention of the *ā* in the first syllable in אֶלְתִּי, &c., Gn 24⁴¹, &c., is abnormal.

O 3. Paradigm III, cf. the various forms in § 94 *d* and *f-h*. The dual חוֹמָתַיִם *two walls*, Is 22¹¹, &c., taken directly from the plur. חוֹמוֹת, for חוֹמָתַיִם, is abnormal (cf. § 87 *s*, and the proper name גִּדְרֵתַיִם Jos 15⁸⁶).—Among the forms resembling participles *Qal* of verbs ע"ו, such as זָרָה (masc. זָר from *zār*, hence with unchangeable *ā*), must be reckoned also בָּמָה *high place* (from בּוֹם), which has for its constr. st. plur. the pleonastic form בָּמוֹתַי, or written defectively בָּמוֹתַי (see § 87 *s*); for this the Masora everywhere requires בָּמוֹתַי, which is to be read *bāmōthē* (not *bōmōthē*), with an anomalous shortening of the *ō* to *ē*; but with suffixes בָּמוֹתַי, &c.

p In a wider sense the feminines of the form קָטַל (§ 84^b *e*) belong to this class, in so far as they shorten the *ā* of the second syllable before the termination ת, e.g. דִּלְגָּת *inflammation* (from *dallāgt*), with suff. צִדְקָתָהּ Ez 16⁵²; טַבַּעַת *signet*; also fem. of the forms קָטַל and קָטַל (§ 84^b *c* and *d*), as אֶילָת *folly* (for 'iowālt), and of all the forms which have a changeable vowel in the second syllable, and are formed with the prefix מ (§ 85 *g-k*), e.g. מַמְלָכָה *kingdom*, constr. always מַמְלָכָת; מִזְמָרָה (not used in the sing.) *pruning-hook*, plur. מִזְמָרוֹת; מִשְׁפָּרָת *reward*, with suff. מִשְׁפָּרָתַי; cf. also the examples given in § 85 *g* and *p*, like מוֹלָדָת *birth* (but from ל"א מוֹצֵאָה *outgoing*), תּוֹלָדָת *generation*, תּוֹעֵבָה *abomination*, constr. תּוֹעֵבָת, &c.

q Sometimes the plural of these forms is to be traced to a secondary form, e.g. אִגָּרָת *a letter*, plur. אִגָּרוֹת (as if from אִגָּרָה); also יוֹנָקוֹת, which is merely formed on the analogy of the other plur. fem. of participles *Qal*, is to be referred to a sing. יוֹנָקָה. Cf., moreover, מִחְרָשֶׁת *ploughshare*, plur. מִחְרָשׁוֹת (as if from מִחְרָשָׁה)¹; on the other hand, כְּתָרוֹת *capitals* (of columns), and תּוֹכָחוֹת *reproofs*, are the regular plurals of כָּתַרָת and תּוֹכַחַת.

¹ עֲשֵׂתָרָת *Astarte* (plur. עֲשֵׂתָרוֹת), which was formerly included among these examples, is most probably due to an intentional alteration of the

In בְּתִנְתָּ *coat* the original *ū* of the first syllable is maintained by the *r* sharpening of the following consonant (cf. Arab. *qūtūn*), with suff. בְּתִנְתִּי, the *constr. st.*, however, is בְּתִנְתָּ (as also in the *absol. st.* in Ex 28³⁰); plur. בְּתִנְתּוֹת, *constr. st.* בְּתִנְתּוֹת.—The form גְּלִילָה given in Paradigm III, *b* is a *Pūlpūl*-form of the stem גְּלִל, cf. קְרָקַר, § 84^b *p*.

4. To the fourth class, for which no Paradigm is required, belong all the *s* numerous forms which in classical Hebrew have unchangeable vowels throughout, the originally short vowel of the first syllable having become *Šewā*, owing to the tone being thrown forward. Of the forms mentioned in §§ 84 and 85 those from ע"ע stems especially belong to this class, as מְנִלָּה scroll, תְּהִלָּה praise, תְּפִלָּה prayer (§ 85 *i* and *q*), as well as the feminine of the participle *Hiph'ul* of verbs ע"ע, e.g. מְאִירָה enlightening (from מְאִיר), and generally the feminines of ע"ע stems which are compounded with the *preformative* מ, as מְנוּחָה rest (from מְנוּחַ), see § 85 *l*; from ל"ה stems perhaps also תְּעִלָּה conduit (*constr. st.* תְּעִלְתָּ Is 7³, &c.) and תְּלָאָה travail. Thus all these forms coincide externally with those which already, in the masculine form, have unchangeable vowels throughout (see the list of them in § 93 *ws*).

5. The feminine ending יָת (apart from ל"ה-forms like בְּבִית, § 94^f) arises *t* from the addition of the feminine ת to the ending יָ, which is employed to form adjectives, &c., see § 86 *d*, *h*, and *k*. The ending וֹת, mentioned there, is attached, in segholate forms, sometimes to the ground-form, as עֲשֵׂתוֹת Jb 12⁵ (v.l. עֲשֵׂתוֹת), sometimes to forms with a loosely-closed syllable, as מְלָכּוֹת kingdom; from ל"ה stems we find forms sometimes like שְׁבוּת captivity (according to others from the stem שָׁב, like לְבוּת perverseness from לָו), sometimes like בְּכוּת weeping, גְּלוּת exile, חֲזוֹת vision; the latter retain the *ā* of the first syllable even in the *constr. st.* and before suffixes. From a *qāṭil*-form is formed בְּבִירוֹת heaviness; from a *qāṭil*-form בְּפָקֻדוֹת, &c.

In the plural of these forms different methods of treatment may be distin- *u* guished. In some cases the whole ending וֹת is retained, as if belonging to the stem (cf. above, *f*), e.g. אֶלְמְנוֹתָי from אֶלְמְנוֹת, in others this ending is resolved, as in מְלָכִיּוֹת Dn 8²² (no doubt for *māl'khuwōth*), and עֵדוֹת 'edle'wōth, from עֵדוֹת testimony, but only with suffixes, עֵדוֹתַי ψ 119¹⁴, &c.; עֵדוֹתַי 1 K 2³, &c.

§ 96. *Nouns of Peculiar Formation.*

In the following Paradigms,¹ pp. 282 to 284, a number of frequently used nouns are arranged, whose flexion presents more or less striking peculiarities. These peculiarities, however, are almost always subordinate to the usual phonetic laws, and the usual designation of the nouns as *irregular* is, therefore, not justified, when once the ground-forms are properly recognized on which the present forms are based.

original עֲשֵׂתָהּ, like מְלָה Lv 18²¹, &c. (for מְלָה), with the vowels of בִּשְׁתָּ shame, the latter word being substituted in reading for the name of the goddess.

¹ The only omissions from these Paradigms are אָחָר, אָחָה, and חֲמוֹת (on which see the remarks), and all forms which are not found in the O. T.

<i>Sing. absolute</i>	אָב (father)	אָח (brother)	אָחוֹת (sister)	אִישׁ (man)	אִשָּׁה (woman)
„ <i>construct</i>	אָבִי	אָחִי	אָחוֹת	אִישׁ	אִשָּׁת
„ <i>with suff. of 1 sing.</i>	אָבִי	אָחִי	אָחֹתִי	אִישִׁי	אִשְׁתִּי
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	אָבֶיךָ	אָחֶיךָ	אָחוֹתְךָ		אִשְׁתְּךָ
„ <i>2 fem.</i>	אָבִיךָ	אָחִיךָ	אָחוֹתְךָ	אִישְׁךָ	
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	אָבִיו (אָבִיהוּ)	אָחִיו (אָחִיהוּ)	אָחוֹתוֹ	אִישׁוֹ	אִשְׁתּוֹ
„ <i>3 fem.</i>	אָבִיהָ	אָחִיהָ	אָחוֹתָהּ	אִשָּׁתָהּ	
„ <i>1 Pl.</i>	אָבֵינוּ	אָחֵינוּ	אָחוֹתֵנוּ		
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	אָבֵיכֶם	אָחֵיכֶם	[אָחוֹתֵכֶם]		
„ <i>2 fem.</i>	אָבֵיכֶן				
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	אָבֵיהֶם	אָחֵיהֶם	אָחוֹתֶם		
„ <i>3 fem.</i>	אָבֵיהֶן				
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	אָבוֹת	אָחִים		אֲנָשִׁים	נָשִׁים
„ <i>construct</i>	אָבוֹת	אָחִי		אֲנָשִׁי	נָשִׁי
„ <i>with suff. of 1 sing.</i>	אָבוֹתִי	אָחִי, pause	אָחוֹתִי	אֲנָשִׁי	נָשִׁי
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֶיךָ	אָחֶיךָ		אֲנָשֶׁיךָ	נָשֶׁיךָ
„ <i>2 fem.</i>		אָחֶיךָ	אָחוֹתֶיךָ		
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	אָבוֹתָיו	אָחָיו	אָחוֹתָיו	אֲנָשָׁיו	נָשָׁיו
„ <i>3 fem.</i>		אָחֶיהָ		אֲנָשֶׁיהָ	
„ <i>1 Pl.</i>	אָבוֹתֵינוּ	אָחֵינוּ		אֲנָשֵׁינוּ	נָשֵׁינוּ
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֵיכֶם	אָחֵיכֶם	אָחוֹתֵיכֶם		נָשֵׁיכֶם
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֵיהֶם (אָבוֹתֵיהֶם)	אָחֵיהֶם	אָחוֹתֵיהֶם	אֲנָשֶׁיהֶם	נָשֶׁיהֶם
„ <i>3 fem.</i>				אֲנָשֶׁיהֶן	

REMARKS.

אָב father; the *constr.* אָבִי, like אָחִי and בְּנִי (which occurs once), belongs to the connective forms discussed in § 90 *k*, which serve as the model for the *Hireq compaginis*. However, אָב also occurs in compound proper names, e.g. אַבְשָׁלוֹם, beside אַבְיָשָׁלוֹם, &c.; also Gn 17⁴ f. אַבְרָהָם for the purpose of explaining the name אַבְרָהָם. On the plur. אָבוֹת see § 87 *p*.

אָח brother. The plur. absol. אָחִים has *Dageš forte implicitum* (§ 22 *c*); אָחִי stands for אָחָיו according to the phonetic law stated in § 27 *q*, and so also אָחִי in *pause* for אָחִי. The sharpening of the ח merely serves to keep the preceding *Pathah* short, as in נְמָלִים, &c. (§ 93 *ee*).

אָח one (for אָחָד, likewise with *Dageš forte implicitum*, § 22 *c*, cf. § 27 *q*), *constr.* and otherwise in close connexion, אָחָד, Gn 48²², 2 S 17²², Is 27¹²,

אָמָה (handmaid)	בֵּית (house)	בֶּן (son)	בַּת (daughter)	יוֹם (day)	כֵּלִי (vessel)
אִמְתִּי	בֵּיתִי	בְּנִי	בַּתִּי	יוֹם	כֵּלִי
אִמְתְּךָ	בֵּיתְךָ	בְּנֶךָ, <i>pause</i>	בַּתְּךָ, <i>pause</i>		כֵּלֶיךָ
	בֵּיתְךָ	בְּנֶךָ			
אִמְתּוֹ	בֵּיתוֹ	בְּנוֹ	בַּתּוֹ	יוֹמוֹ	
אִמְתָּהּ	בֵּיתָהּ	בְּנָהּ	בַּתָּהּ		
		בְּנֶנּוּ			
	בֵּיתְכֶם		בַּתְּכֶם		
	בֵּיתָם			יוֹמָם	
אִמְהוֹת	בָּתִּים	בָּנִים	בָּנוֹת	יָמִים	כֵּלִים
אִמְהוֹת	בָּתֵּי	בְּנֵי	בָּנוֹת	יָמֵי	כֵּלִי
אִמְהֵי		בְּנֵי	בָּנוֹתֵי	יָמֵי	כֵּלִי
	בָּתֵּיךְ	בְּנֵיךְ	בָּנוֹתֵיךְ	יָמֵיךְ	כֵּלֵיךְ
	בָּתֵּיךָ	בְּנֵיךָ	בָּנוֹתֵיךָ	יָמֵיךָ	
אִמְהֵי		בְּנֵי	בָּנוֹתֵי	יָמֵי	כֵּלֵי
אִמְהֵי		בְּנֵיהָ	בָּנוֹתֶיהָ	יָמֶיהָ	כֵּלֶיהָ
	בָּתֵּינוּ	בְּנֵינוּ	בָּנוֹתֵינוּ	יָמֵינוּ	כֵּלֵינוּ
אִמְהֵיכֶם	בָּתֵּיכֶם	בְּנֵיכֶם	בָּנוֹתֵיכֶם	יָמֵיכֶם	כֵּלֵיכֶם
	בָּתֵּיהֶם	בְּנֵיהֶם	בָּנוֹתֵיהֶם	יָמֵיהֶם	כֵּלֵיהֶם
אִמְהֵיהֶן	בָּתֵּיהֶן	בְּנֵיהֶן			

Zc 11⁷; and especially before מֶן (מִן) Gn 3²², Ex 30¹⁴, Nu 16¹⁵, Ju 17⁵, 1 S 9³, Ez 18¹⁰; fem. אִמְתִּי *una* (for אִמְתְּךָ, according to § 19 *d*), in *pause* אִמְתִּי. Once חַד masc. (by aphaeresis, § 19 *h*), Ez 33³⁰, as in Aramaic; plur. אִמְתֵּי *some*, but also *idem*.

אִחֹת *sister*, from 'āḥwāt or 'āḥyāt, with elision of the ו or י, and with the ā, which has arisen from āā, obscured to ā.¹ In Nu 6⁷ אִחֹתוֹ stands for אִחֹתִי (with virtual sharpening of the ח). The plur. *absol.* (אִחֵי) does not happen

¹ This explanation of אִחֹת (and חֲמוֹת q. v.) still seems to us more probable than the assumption that the fem. ending āth is lengthened to compensate for the loss of the 3rd radical (so Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, vi. 258), or that the form is derived from 'āḥā, the old-semitic *constr. st.* of the accusative, with ח feminine (so Barth, *ZDMG.* 1899, p. 598).

<i>Sing. absolute</i>	[מִי] (water)	עִיר (city)	פֶּה (mouth)	רֹאשׁ (head)	שֵׁם (name)	[שָׁמַי] (heaven)
„ construct		עִיר	פִּי	רֹאשׁ	שֵׁם, שָׁם	
„ with suff. of 1 sing.		עִירִי	פִּי	רֹאשִׁי	שְׁמִי	
„ 2 masc.		עִירְךָ	פִּיךָ	רֹאשְׁךָ	שְׁמֶךָ, pause	
„ 2 fem.				רֹאשֶׁךָ	שְׁמֶךָ	
„ 3 masc.		עִירוֹ	פִּיהוּ, פִּיו	רֹאשׁוֹ	שְׁמוֹ	
„ 3 fem.		עִירָהּ	פִּיהָ	רֹאשָׁהּ	שְׁמָהּ	
„ 1 Pl.			פִּינוּ	רֹאשֵׁנוּ	שְׁמָנוּ	
„ 2 masc.			פִּיכֶם	רֹאשֵׁכֶם	שְׁמֶכֶם	
„ 3 masc.		עִירָם	פִּיהֶם	רֹאשֵׁם	שְׁמָם	
„ 3 fem.			פִּיהֶן	רֹאשֵׁן		
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מִים	עָרִים	פִּיּוֹת	רֹאשִׁים	שְׁמוֹת	שְׁמָיִם
„ construct	מִימֵי, מִי	עָרֵי		רֹאשֵׁי	שְׁמוֹת	שְׁמֵי
„ with suff. of 1 sing.	מִימִי	עָרִי				
„ 2 masc.	מִימֶיךָ	עָרֶיךָ				שְׁמַיְךָ
„ 2 fem.		עָרֶיךָ				
„ 3 masc.	מִימֵיו	עָרָיו		רֹאשָׁיו		שְׁמָיו
„ 3 fem.	מִימֶיהָ	עָרֶיהָ		רֹאשֶׁיהָ		
„ 1 Pl.	מִימֵינוּ	עָרֵינוּ		רֹאשֵׁינוּ		
„ 2 masc.		עָרֵיכֶם		רֹאשֵׁיכֶם		שְׁמֵיכֶם
„ 3 masc.	מִימֵיהֶם	עָרֵיהֶם		רֹאשֵׁיהֶם	שְׁמוֹתָם	
„ 3 fem.				רֹאשֵׁיהֶן	שְׁמוֹתָן	

to occur. In Ez 16⁵² אֶחָתֶיךָ occurs (for אֶחָתֶיךָ). In the forms אֶחָתִי Jos 2¹³ *Keth.*, אֶחָתֶיךָ Ez 16^{51.55.61} (to be read also in verse 45 for אֶחָתֶיךָ, which has been erroneously assimilated to the singular occurring in vv. 48, 49, 56), and אֶחָתֶיכֶם Ho 2³ (for which, however, read אֶחָתֶכֶם), the third radical has been entirely lost.

אִישׁ *man*, according to the common opinion either incorrectly lengthened for אִישׁ (from אִישׁ, with assimilation of the *Nûn* of the ground-form 'inš, which again has been attenuated from 'anš from the stem אָנַשׁ), or softened directly from 'inš. It is, however, probable that a separate stem (אִישׁ to be strong?) is to be assumed for the singular¹; consequently the stem אָנַשׁ to be sociable,

¹ So already Gesenius in his *Thes. Linguae Hebr.*, i. 83 f., and recently again Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegg.*, p. 160 ff., Praetorius in Kuhn's *Orient. L.-B.*, 1884, p. 196; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 38; while Nöldeke (*ZDMG.* 1886, p. 739 f.), against Delitzsch, would connect both אִישׁ and נָשִׁים with the stem אָנַשׁ.

would be connected only with the plur. אִשִּׁים אֲנָשִׁים is found only in Is 53³, ψ 141⁴, Pr 8⁴).

אִמָּה *slave, handmaid*; with the plur. אִמָּהוֹת, with consonantal ה, cf. in Aram. אֲבָהָה *fathers*, and similarly in Phoen. דִּלְהַת from דִּלַת, also Arab. 'abahāt (fathers), 'ummahāt (mothers), with an artificial expansion into a trilateral stem.

אִשָּׁה *woman*, probably for אֲנִישָׁה; from אָנַשׁ i.e. not (as Aram. אֲנַתָּא shows) אֲנִישׁ to be sociable (see above, on אִישׁ) but אָנַשׁ to be weak (Arab. 'anūṭī). So De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, p. 68; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 159 f. The form אִשָּׁת (for 'īšt, with ת fem., from 'īšš, after rejection of the doubling and lengthening of the *i* to *ē*) occurs in Dt 21¹¹, 1 S 28⁷, ψ 58⁹, even in *absol. st.* [cf., however, below, § 130. 4, 5].—In ψ 128³ אִשְׁתֶּךָ is found for אִשְׁתְּךָ. Instead of the plur. נָשִׁים, we find in Ez 23⁴⁴ אִשָּׁת.¹

בַּיִת *house*, locative בֵּיתָה, הַבַּיִתָּה, in *pause* בֵּיתָה, הַבַּיִתָּה, *constr.* בֵּיתָה, plur. בָּתִּים (but in Dt 6¹¹, 1 Ch 28¹¹ בָּתִּים without *Metheg*), pronounced *bāttim*. The explanation of the Dageš in the ת is still a matter of dispute. The Syriac *bāttin*, however, shows that the *Dageš* is original, and belongs to the character of the form.² According to Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 88, בָּתִּים is simply contracted from *bai-tim* (as אֵן from אֵין, עֵינִים from עֵינִים, &c.), and the *Dageš*, therefore, is *lene*; König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 56, proposes the name *Dageš forte orthoconsonanticum*; on the other hand Rahlfs, *ThLZ.* 1896, col. 587, suggests that the *ʾ* is assimilated to the ת, while Philippi, *ZDMG.* xlix, p. 206, assumes for the plural a stem distinct from that of the singular. A definite solution is at present impossible. The incorrectness of the formerly common pronunciation *bōttim* is sufficiently shown by the Babylonian punctuation (see § 8 g, note 3), which leaves no doubt as to the *ā*.

בֵּן *son* (Gn 30¹⁹ בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל) *constr.* usually בֶּן (also with a conjunctive accent as an equivalent for *Maqqeph*, Gn 17¹⁷, Is 8², &c., 1 Ch 9²¹; even with smaller disjunctives, especially in the combination מֶבֶן, Ex 30¹⁴, Lv 27³, &c. [מֶבֶן] only after וְאֵם and before הָרֵשׁ, also in Is 51¹²; see Strack on Ex 30¹⁴]), rarely בֶּן־ (Dt 25², Jon 4¹⁰ twice, Pr 30¹, and so always in the combination בֶּן־נֶנֶן, and in the proper names בְּנֵי־מִינִי [but בֶּן־מִינִי *Benjamite*] and בֶּן־יִקָּה Pr 30¹), once בְּנִי (cf. § 90 l) Gn 49¹¹, and בְּנוֹ (§ 90 o) Nu 23¹⁸, 24^{3,15}.—In Gn 49²² בֶּן, for which בֶּן־ ought to be read, is intended by the Masora for the *absol. st.*, not the *constr.*

¹ Friedr. Delitzsch (in his Babylonian glosses to Baer's text of Ezekiel, p. xi) on Ez 23⁴⁴ remarks that in Assyro-Babylonian the plur. of *aššatu* (woman) is *aššāti*, corresponding, therefore, to אִשָּׁת, not to the ordinary plur. נָשִׁים. The *a* of נָשִׁים (instead of *i* as in Arab. or *e* as in Syr.) is to be explained with Barth (*Orient. Studien zu Ehren Th. Nöldekes*, Giessen, 1906, p. 792) from the natural connexion of the ideas 'men' and 'women', נָשִׁים and אֲנָשִׁים.

² This disposes of the traditional view that the *Dageš* (after a firm *Metheg*, see § 16 f) only serves to distinguish it from בָּתִּים *passing the night*, ptc. Qal of בִּית, a stem which never occurs in the O. T. According to P. Haupt the stem is בָּא to go in, ת therefore being the feminine termination, as in *bint daughter*, and the original form *ba'tu, būtu* (entrance) is preserved in the plural *bāttim* where the *tt* is to be explained as due to the analogy of trisyllabic stems. In the singular *bāt* passed into *bēt* (?), and this was resolved into *bait*, as *Yerūšālem* into *Yerūšālayim*.

בַּת *daughter* (from *bant*, and this again, according to the law stated in § 69 c, for *bint*, fem. of בֵּן), with suff. בְּתִי for בָּתִּי. Plur. בָּנוֹת, from the sing. בָּנָה, comp. בָּנִים *sons*.

חָם *husband's father*, only with suff. חָמִי, חָמִיָּה; and חֲמוּת *husband's mother*, only with suff. חֲמוּתָהּ, חֲמוּתָהּ. Cf. אָח, אָחָא, and especially אחות.

יוֹם *day* (Arab. *yaum*),¹ dual יוֹמִים; the plur. יָמִים is probably from a different sing. (יָ יām), constr. יָמִי and (poetically) יָמוֹת, Dt 32⁷, ψ 90¹⁵.

כֶּלִי *vessel*, in pause כֶּלִי (with suff. כֶּלִיָּךְ Dt 23²⁵) from כָּלָה *to contain*, plur. כֵּלִים (as if from כָּל, כֵּלָה; according to König, ii. 63, shortened from *kilyim*).

מַיִם *water*; on the plur. cf. § 88 d.

עִיר *city*. The plur. עָרִים is scarcely syncopated from עִירִים, as it is pointed in Ju 10⁴ (no doubt erroneously, in imitation of the preceding עִירִים *ass colts*), but from a kindred sing. עָר, which still occurs in proper names.

פֶּה *mouth*, constr. st. פִּי (for original פִּי = פֶּה?). Its origin is still disputed. According to Gesenius and König (ii. 103), פֶּה stands for פִּאָה (ground-form *pi'ay*) from פָּאָה *to breathe, to blow*; according to Olshausen, for פִּי, from a stem פִּיה or פִּוה. But parallel with the Hebrew פֶּה are Assy. *pû*, Arab. *fû*, *fam*, *famm*, *fumm*, bibl. Aram. פִּם, פִּמָּא, Syr. *pûm*, *pûmā*, so that Barth, ZDMG. xli, p. 634, assumes two forms of development from the same stem (פִּמו), viz. *fm* and *fw*. פִּי *my mouth*, from *pi-y*; for פִּיהֶם we find in ψ 17¹⁰, 58⁷, 59¹³ פִּימוֹ. The supposed plur. פִּים I S 13²¹ is generally explained as a contraction from פִּיִּים, but the text is altogether corrupt. The plur. פְּיֹת, for the *edges* of a sword, occurs in Pr 5⁴; reduplicated פִּיפִיּוֹת Is 41¹⁵, ψ 149⁶.

רֹאשׁ *head* (obscured from רֹאשׁ = *rû's*); plur. רִאשִׁים (for רִאשִׁים, § 23 c); ראשֵׁי only in Is 15².

רֹשׁ *a head of small cattle* (sheep or goat), constr. st. רֹשׁ, with suff. רֹשׁוֹ I S 14³⁴ and רֹשָׁיו Dt 22¹, according to König, ii. 131, from a ground-form *si'ay*, but according to De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, 81 f., from a stem וְשִׁי (רֹשׁ = *say* = *wisay*).

שֵׁם *name*, constr. generally שֵׁם (only six times שֵׁם); cf. בֵּן.

שָׁמַיִם *heaven* (§ 88 d).

§ 97. Numerals. (a) Cardinal Numbers.

Brockelmann, *Sem. Sprachwiss.*, p. 116 ff.; *Grundriss*, i. 484 ff.

- a 1. The formation of the cardinal numbers from 3 to 10 (on 1 and 2 see below) has this peculiarity, that numerals connected with a mascu-

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, *Beiträge*, p. 58, *yaum*, probably an extension of a biliteral word which has survived in יָמִים, יָמִי. Barth, however, *Orient. Studien*, p. 791 (see above on אִשָּׁה), sees in יָמִים, יָמִי, יָמוֹת new formations in Hebrew, caused by the naturally close connexion and association of these plurals with שָׁנִים, שָׁנִי, שָׁנוֹת *years*, to which they became assimilated in form. The view that יוֹם is merely an incorrect obscuring of יָם, and therefore distinct from the Arab. *yaum*, is contradicted by the invariable spelling יוֹם, &c., notwithstanding the spelling וְיָם (= וְיָם?) in the Siloam inscription, line 3 (cf. § 7 f), and מִיָּמִים Ho 6². Cf. also the note on § 100 g.

line substantive take the feminine form, and those with a feminine substantive take the masculine form. The common explanation of this strange phenomenon used to be that the primary form of the numeral was an abstract noun in the feminine (cf. § 122 p). This was originally attached in the *constr. st.* to the word qualified, then came to be also used in apposition to it, and finally was placed after it like an adjective. The consequence of the appositional, and finally adjectival, construction was, that for numerals connected with feminine nouns a special shorter form came to be used, whilst the original forms, with the abstract feminine ending, were used in connexion with masculine nouns, after as well as before them.

On this view the historical process would have been that originally the abstract numerals (like Latin *trias*, *decas*, Greek *πεντάς*, *δεκάς*, &c.) were placed in the *constr. st.* before masculines and feminines alike, e. g. *שְׁלֹשֶׁת בָּנִים trias filiorum*, *עֶשְׂרֵת נָשִׁים decas mulierum*. A trace of this earlier usage was seen in the examples mentioned under c, like *שְׁלֹשֶׁת נָשִׁים*.—Further, it was possible to say *שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּנִים trias*, sc. *filii*, as well as *בָּנִים שְׁלֹשָׁה filii, trias*. From this second appositional construction it was only a step to the treatment of the abstract numeral as an adjective, *filii tres*. Similarly the subsequently shortened forms of the abstract numeral, which were used in connexion with feminines, might stand either in the *constr. st.* before, or in apposition before or after the word numbered, thus *שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּנוֹת trias filiarum*, or *בָּנוֹת שְׁלֹשָׁה trias*, sc. *filiae*, or *בָּנוֹת שְׁלֹשָׁה filiae, trias*, or adjectivally *filiae tres*.

A different and much more intelligible explanation of the striking disagreement between the gender of the numeral and that of the word numbered has recently been given by Reckendorf, *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen*, pt. ii, Leiden, 1898, p. 265 ff. He also considers that the earliest forms were abstract numerals which were placed in the *constr. st.* before the noun numbered, the latter depending on them in the genitive. The original form, however, of the abstract numerals from 3 to 9 is not the feminine, but the masculine, used for both genders, as it still is in the tens, 20, 30, &c. The feminine abstract numeral was first distinguished by a special form in the numbers from 13 to 19 (see further, below) when connected with masculines, and this distinction was afterwards extended to the numbers from 3 to 10. This explanation does not affect the view stated above that the appositional and adjectival use of the abstract numerals was only adopted later in addition to their use in the genitive construction.

The differentiation of the numerals (originally of common gender) into masculine and feminine forms in the second decade, was occasioned, according to Reckendorf, by the use of the abstract feminine *עֶשְׂרֵה* in compounds.

So long as it was felt that *שְׁלֹשׁ עָשָׂרָה* simply meant *the three of the decade*, the gender of the noun numbered made no difference. When, however, the consciousness of this meaning became weakened and the combination of units and tens came to be felt as a copulative rather than a genitive relation, it seemed suitable to connect only feminine nouns with the feminine form *עָשָׂרָה*. New forms were therefore invented, both of the units and the tens, for use with masculine nouns. The former, however, no longer had the form of the *constr.* but of the absolute state, clearly showing that the consciousness of the original syntactical relation in *שְׁלֹשׁ עָשָׂרָה*, &c., was lost. On the other hand, after the extension of these new formations to the first decade, the new feminine forms readily came to be used also in the genitive construction (and therefore in the *constr. st.*) on the analogy of the earlier masculine forms.

Of the first two numerals, *אֶחָד* *one*, with its fem. *אֶחָת* (see § 96), may be recognized, from its form and use, as an adjective, although even so it admits of such combinations as *אֶחָד הַהָרִים* *unus e montibus*. The numeral two, as would be expected, appears as an abstract in the *dual*, but, like the other numerals, can also stand in apposition to the noun numbered. In form it always agrees with the gender of its noun. Accordingly, the numerals from 1 to 10 are as follows :

<i>b</i>	With the Masculine.		With the Feminine.	
	<i>Absol.</i>	<i>Constr.</i>	<i>Absol.</i>	<i>Constr.</i>
1.	אֶחָד	אֶחָד	אֶחָת	אֶחָת
2.	שְׁנַיִם	שְׁנֵי	¹ שְׁתֵּי	שְׁתֵּי
3.	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשֶׁת	שְׁלֹשׁ	שְׁלֹשׁ
4.	אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבַּעַת	אַרְבַּע	אַרְבַּע
5.	² חֲמִשָּׁה	חֲמִשֶּׁת	חֲמִשׁ	חֲמִשׁ
6.	שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשֶׁת	שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשׁ
7.	שִׁבְעָה	שִׁבְעַת	שִׁבַּע	³ [שִׁבַּע]
8.	שְׁמוֹנָה	שְׁמוֹנַת	שְׁמוֹנָה	שְׁמוֹנָה
9.	תִּשְׁעָה	תִּשְׁעַת	תִּשַׁע	³ [תִּשַׁע]
10.	עָשָׂרָה	עָשָׂרַת	עָשָׂר	עָשָׂר

¹ Shortened from *שְׁנֵתַיִם*, which would be the regular feminine form of *שְׁנַיִם*. Nevertheless, the *Dageš* in *שְׁתֵּי*, &c. (even after *מִן*; *מִשְׁתֵּי* Jon 4¹¹; cf., however, *מִשְׁתֵּי* Ju 16²⁸), can by no means be regarded as a *Dageš forte* arising from assimilation of the *Nūn*, for in that case the word could only be *שְׁתֵּי* (cf. Arab. *īntāni*). This form does occur in the Codex Babylonicus of A.D. 916, but it is only a later correction for *שְׁתֵּי*, while in the Berlin MS. or. qu. 680 described by Kahle (Lpz. 1902) there is no trace of the *Dageš*. It is rather to be read *štáyim*, *štē* (with *Dageš lene*), cf. *אַשְׁתֵּי*, representing the later Palestinian pronunciation (Philippi, *ZDMG.* xlix, p. 206), and Arab. *īnātāni* (with a kind of prosthetic *ā*; cf. § 19 m), as a further feminine form of

On the connective forms שָׁבַע, הִשָּׁע, cf. the analogous forms in § 93 h.

The other Semitic languages also exhibit the same peculiarity in the external differentiation of the numerals from 3 to 10 as regards gender. The fem. form of the numeral abstracts is only rarely found in connexion with feminine nouns,⁴ e. g. נְשִׁים נִשְׁלָשֶׁת Gn 7¹³, 1 S 10³, Jb 1⁴, Ez 7² *Keth.*; probably also Jos 17¹¹, where we should read with Dillmann הַנְּפֹת שִׁ'. In apposition, Zc 3⁹, 4², cf. Jer 36²³. From what was said above, under *a*, it follows that these cases are not a return to original usage, but only an intrusion of the form used before masculines into the sphere of the feminine. Conversely in Gn 38²⁴ נְשִׁים הָרָשִׁים (but in the Samaritan נִשְׁלָשֶׁת).—For שִׁבְעָה *seven*, there occurs in Jb 42¹³ the strange form שִׁבְעָנָה, according to Ewald [*Ausführl. Lehrs.*³, § 269 b] an old feminine substantive (German *ein Siebend*, a set of seven), but more probably a scribal error.

2. The numerals from 11 to 19 are formed by placing the units, *d* without the *copula*, before the number ten (in the form עָשָׂר masc., עֶשְׂרֵה fem.), but without the two words being joined into one. As was said above, under *a*, and as is proved by the use of אֶחָד, אַחַת in the numeral 11, the feminine numerals from 13 to 19 are to be regarded as *construct* forms in a genitive connexion. The connective forms of the masculine abstracts, like נִשְׁלָשֶׁת, &c., are not admitted in combination with עָשָׂר, since they are merely in apposition, and not in a genitive relation (see the rare exceptions at the end of *e*). On the other hand שְׁנֵי and שְׁתֵּי in the numeral 12 are undoubtedly true *constructs*, like אֶחָד and the fem. numerals 13–19. But instead of שְׁנֵי (Ex 28²¹, Jos 3¹² and four other places) and שְׁתֵּי (Jos 4⁸ and three times in Ezek.), we generally find שְׁנַיִם and שְׁתַּיִם. Two explanations have been given of these forms: (1) that the *Kethibh* really intends שְׁנַיִם, שְׁתַּיִם, in the *absol. st.*, which was first introduced in the case of שְׁנַיִם, on the analogy of עֶשְׂרֵה, &c., and then extended to שְׁתַּיִם; the *Mazora*, however, required שְׁנֵי, שְׁתֵּי (but see below), and therefore pointed שְׁנַיִם, שְׁתַּיִם as a *Qrê perpetuum* (see § 17).—(2) that the *absolute* forms שְׁנַיִם, שְׁתַּיִם (introduced on the analogy of נִשְׁלָשֶׁת, &c.) were contracted to שְׁנֵי, שְׁתֵּי to facilitate the pronunciation of the duals when closely

ʾitnāni, duo. According to Barth (*Orient. Studien* . . . Th. Nöldeke, ii. 792 f.) the irregularity of שְׁתַּיִם (he takes the Dageš as *Dageš forte*) is due to the complete assimilation of its vowels to those of the masc. שְׁנַיִם where the *Šwā mobile* is normal.

² With Dageš probably on the analogy of נִשְׁלָשֶׁת, as נִשְׁשֶׁת on the analogy of נִשְׁלָשֶׁת. Cf. also J. K. Blake on חֲמִשָּׁה, חֲמִשִּׁים in *JAOS*, 1905, p. 117 ff.

³ שָׁבַע and הִשָּׁע appear only as connective forms before עֶשְׂרֵה and מֵאוֹת.

⁴ In the vulgar dialects of Arabic, and in Ethiopic, the feminine form of the numeral is by far the more common. This form appears also in Hebrew, when the number is regarded in the abstract, as in the multiplicatives (see § 97 h).

connected with עֶשֶׂר and עֶשְׂרֵה, and that the contraction is founded on an early and correct tradition. The second explanation is supported by the large number of examples of שְׁנִים (66) and שְׁתִּים (34). It would be strange if the Masora required the alteration of the far commoner forms on account of isolated instances of נְשִׁי and נְשִׁי. As a matter of fact even in regard to the latter forms the tradition often varies between נְשִׁי and נְשִׁים, &c., cf. e. g. Ginsburg on Jos 3¹². We cannot therefore assume a *Q^{er}ê perpetuum*.

e Accordingly the numbers from 11 upwards are—

	Masculine.	Feminine.
	אַחַד עֶשֶׂר	אַחַת עֶשְׂרֵה
11.	{ עֶשְׂתִּי עֶשֶׂר	עֶשְׁתִּי עֶשְׂרֵה
	שְׁנִים עֶשֶׂר	שְׁתִּים עֶשְׂרֵה
12.	{ נְשִׁי עֶשֶׂר	נְשִׁי עֶשְׂרֵה
	נְשִׁים עֶשֶׂר	נְשִׁים עֶשְׂרֵה
13.	שְׁלֹשָׁה עֶשֶׂר	שְׁלֹשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה

&c., on the analogy of the last. These numerals regularly have only the above form. In regard to their syntax, cf. § 134 f.

Very rarely the units appear in the *masc.* in the *constr. st.*, as חֲמִשָּׁת עֶשֶׂר fifteen, Ju 8¹⁰, 2 S 19¹⁸; שְׁמֹנֶת עֶשֶׂר eighteen, Ju 20²⁵.—Connected by וְ we find עֶשְׂרֵה וְחֲמִשָּׁה in Ex 45¹².

f 3. The tens from 30 to 90 are expressed by the plural forms of the units (so that the plural here always stands for *ten times* the unit), thus, 30 שְׁלֹשִׁים, 40 אַרְבָּעִים, 50 חֲמִשִּׁים, 60 שִׁשִּׁים, 70 שִׁבְעִים, 80 שְׁמֹנִים, 90 תְּשַׁעִּים. But twenty is expressed by עֶשְׂרִים, plur. of עֶשֶׂר *ten*.² These numerals are all of common gender, and do not admit of the *construct state*.—In compound numerals, like 22, 23, 44, &c., the units

¹ עֶשְׂתִּי, which remained for a long time unexplained, was recognized (first by J. Oppert) in the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions in the form *istin* or *istên*; cf. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 203, and P. Haupt, in the *American Journal of Philology*, viii. 279. Accordingly, עֶשְׂתִּי עֶשֶׂר is a compound, like the Sansk. *ekādaśan*, *ēvdeka*, *undecim* (analogous to the combination of units and tens in the numerals from 12 to 19), and is used at the same time in the composition of the feminine numeral eleven. On the gradual substitution of עֶשְׂתִּי ע' for אַחַד ע' and אַחַת ע' see Giesebrecht in *ZAW*. 1881, p. 226; עֶשְׂתִּי ע' occurs only in Jer., Ez., in the prologue to Deuteronomy (1⁸), in the Priestly Code, and in passages undoubtedly post-exilic, so that it may very well be a loan-word from the Babylonian.

² For עֶשְׂרִים, שִׁבְעִים, תְּשַׁעִּים (from the *segholates* עֶשֶׂר, שִׁבְעַ, תְּשַׁע), we should expect *asārim*, *ṣebhā'im*, *tesā'im*. Is this very unusual deviation from the common formation (see above, § 93 l, o, r) connected with the special meaning of these plurals, or are these survivals of an older form of the plural of *segholates*?

may precede (*two and twenty*, as in Arabic and English), e.g. Nu 3³⁹, 26¹⁴. Very frequently, however, the reverse order is found (*twenty and two*, as in Syriac, cf. French and English *twenty-two*), e.g. 1 Ch 12²⁸, 18⁵.¹ In all cases the units and tens are connected by the *copula*, ordinarily ׀, but ׀ before numerals with the tone on the penultima, ׀ before ׀, 1 before Š^ewa; see § 104 d, e, g.

The remaining numerals are the substantives—

g

100 מֵאָה fem., constr. מֵאָת.

200 מֵאָתַיִם dual (contracted from מֵאָתַיִם; cf. § 23 c).

300 שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת plur. (but in 2 K 11^{4.9.10.15}, *Keth.* הַמֵּאוֹת).

1000 אֶלֶף masc.

2000 אֶלְפַּיִם dual.

3000 שְׁלֹשָׁת אֶלְפִים plur., and so on (except עֶשְׂרֵה אֶלְפִים in 2 S 18³, 2 K 24¹⁴ *Keth.*; elsewhere always עֶשְׂרֵת אֶלְפִים).

10000 רְבֹוא, רְבֹואָה, in the later books the aramaizing² forms רְבֹו, רְבֹוֹת (properly *multitude*, cf. *μυριάς*).

20000 רְבֹוֹתַיִם dual (see below, h); but שְׁתֵּי רְבֹוֹת Neh 7⁷⁰ (also שְׁתֵּי רְבֹוֹת Neh 7⁷¹).

40000 אַרְבַּע רְבֹוֹת Neh 7⁶⁶.

60000 שֵׁשׁ־רְבֹוֹת Ezr 2⁶⁹ (Baer and Ginsburg רְבֹוֹת, as in Dn 11¹²). רְבֹוֹת אֶלְפִי thousands of myriads, Gn 24⁶⁰.

Rem. 1. The dual form which occurs in some of the units has the meaning *h* of our ending -fold, e.g. אַרְבַּעַתַּיִם fourfold, 2 S 12⁶; שִׁבְעַתַּיִם sevenfold, Gn 4^{15.24}, Is 30²⁶, ψ 12⁷, 79¹² (cf. § 134 r). The dual רְבֹוֹתַיִם ψ 68¹⁸ (explained by שְׁנָאֵן אֶלְפִי thousands of duplication) is not meant to be taken in the sense of *two myriads* or *twice the number of myriads*, but in a multiplicative sense.³—Besides the plural which denotes the tens, there are also the plurals אֲחֵרִים some, also *idem*, and עֶשְׂרֹות decades (not *decem*) Ex 18^{21.25}.

2. The suffixes to numerals are, as with other nouns, properly genitives, *i* although they are translated in English as nominatives, e.g. שְׁלֹשָׁתְּכֶם your triad, i.e. *you three*, Nu 12⁴; חֲמִשָּׁי his fifty (i.e. the 50 belonging to him) 2 K 1⁹⁻¹³, and חֲמִשָּׁיךְ 2 K 10¹².

¹ According to the conclusions of König (*De Criticæ Sacrae Argumento*, p. 61, and *Lehrgeb.*, ii. p. 215 ff.), the smaller number more commonly precedes in Ezek. and the Priestly Code, but the larger always elsewhere. S. Herner (*Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.*, Lund, 1893, p. 71 ff.) arrives at the same conclusion by a full examination of the statistics; cf. also his remarks on König in *ZAW.* 1896, p. 123, and König's reply, *ibid.*, p. 328 f.

² Cf. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im A. T.* (Halle, 1902), p. 79 f.

³ Cf. D. H. Müller, 'Die numeralia multiplicativa in den Amarnatafeln u. im Hebr.', *Semitica*, i, Wien, 1906, p. 13 ff.

§ 98. Numerals. (b) Ordinal Numbers.

a The ordinal numbers from 2 to 10 are formed from the corresponding cardinals by adding the termination יָ— (§ 86 h), before which another יָ— also is generally inserted between the second and third radicals. They are as follows: שְׁנִי *second*, שְׁלִישִׁי (like רְבִיעִי, רִבְעִים, רִבְעָה, without the prosthetic א, which appears in אַרְבַּע, &c.), חֲמִישִׁי or חֲמִישִׁי (which, according to Strack, is always to be read for (חֲמִישִׁי), שְׁשִׁי, שִׁבְעִי, שְׁמִינִי, תְּשִׁיעִי, עֲשִׂירִי. The ordinal *first* is expressed by רִאשׁוֹן (cf. § 27 w), from ראש *head, beginning*, with the termination וֹן (§ 86 f). On the use of אָדָר as an ordinal in numbering the days of the month, cf. § 134 p; in such cases as Gn 1⁵, 2¹¹, the meaning of *first* is derived solely from the context.

b The feminine forms have the termination יָה—, more rarely (and only in the case of 3 and 10) יָהִ— . They are employed also to express fractions, e.g. חֲמִישִׁית *fifth* or *fifth part*, עֲשִׂירִית and עֲשִׂירִיָּה *tenth part*. Side by side with these, in the same sense, there are also forms like רְבִיעַ and רְבִיעָה *a quarter*, חֲמִשָּׁה *a fifth part*, and with the affirmative וֹן, עֲשָׂרֹן (plur. עֲשָׂרֹנִים) *a tenth part*; these are to be regarded as abstracts, and are denominatives from the cardinal numbers. Cf. finally שְׁבִיעַ *εβδομάς, a week*; עֲשֹׂר *a decade* (of days), and also the *tenth day*.

On the expression of the other relations of number, for which the Hebrew has no special forms, see the Syntax, § 134 q and r.

CHAPTER IV

THE PARTICLES

§ 99. General View.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 492 f.

1. The particles, which in general express the secondary modifications of thought in speech, the closer relation of words to one another, and the mutual connexion of sentences, are for the most part either borrowed or derived from noun-forms, sometimes also from pronouns and verbs (§ 30 s). *Primitive* particles (apart from a few demonstrative forms, see § 100 i) can only be so called in the sense defined in § 81 f.

2. So far as the origin of the particles can be discovered with certainty, they are either (1) *borrowed* from other parts of speech; i. e. certain forms of the noun, pronoun, or verb, with more or less loss of their original meaning, have come to be employed as particles; cf. in the Indo-Germanic languages, e. g. the Latin *certo, falso, partim, verum, causa*, the German *statt, anstatt, wegen, weg*, and the English *instead, away*; or (2) *derived* from other parts of speech, either (a) by the *addition* of formative syllables, as *דְּיָ* *by day*, from *דִּי* (cf., however, § 100 g); or most commonly (b) by *abbreviations* effected in various ways, the extent of their mutilation being in proportion to the frequency of their use, so that in some cases (see below) the original stem has become wholly unrecognizable.

Cf. in German *gen*, from *gegen*, *Gegend*; *seit*, from *Seite*; *weil* (originally a particle of time, like our *while*), from *Weile*.

Still more violent abbreviations occur in Greek, Latin, and the Romance languages, e. g. *ἀπό*, *ab, a*; *ἐξ*, *ex, e*; *ad*, Fr. *à*; *aut*, Fr. *ou*, Ital. *o*; *super*, Ital. *su*.¹

The greatest shortening occurs in those particles which have entirely lost the character of an independent word, by being reduced to a single consonant with its vowel (generally short) or *Šewā*. According to the laws of syllable formation in Hebrew (§ 26 m),

¹ Even short phrases are contracted into one word: Lat. *forsitan*, from *fors sit an*, *δηλονότι*, *δηλαδή*, Fr. *peut-être*, Eng. *prithce* from *I pray thee*. — In Chinese most of the particles are verbs or nouns; e. g. *üü* (to give), also the sign of the dative; *ì* (to make use of), *to, for*; *něi* (the interior), *in*.

such particles cannot stand by themselves, but are united, as prefixes, with the following word (§ 102), very much like the preformatives of the imperfect (§ 47 a-d).

d The view that this shortening of whole words to single letters has actually taken place in the gradual course of linguistic development is rendered highly probable by the fact that similar abbreviations in later Hebrew and in Aramaic, i.e. as the development of the original Semitic speech progresses, become more and more striking and frequent. Thus the Biblical Aramaic **דִּי** becomes at a later period **דִּי**; in modern Arabic, e.g. *hallaq* (now) is from *halwaqt*; *leš* (why?) from *li-ayyi-šaiin*, &c. Cf. also the analogous cases mentioned above from the Western languages. Nevertheless, the use of the simplest particles is found already in the earliest periods of the Hebrew language, or, at any rate, in the earliest documents which have come down to us.

e 3. Less frequently particles are formed by *composition*; as **מִדּוּעַ** *wherefore?* for **מִה־יָדוּעַ** *quid edoctus?* (**τί μαθών**;) or *quid cognitum?*; **בְּלַעֲדִי** (from **בֶּל** and **עָדִי**) *besides*; **מִלְּמַעְלָה** (from **מִן**, **לְ**, **מַעְלָה**) *from above, above*.

More frequent is the combination of two words into one without contraction, e.g. **אֶחָד־בָּן**, **אֶחָד־בֵּן**, **בִּיָּאֵם**, **בִּיָּעֵל־בֵּן**; cf. also the compounds of **אֵי** with demonstrative pronouns, as **אֵי־מָה** *from what?*; **אֵי לָזֹאת** *wherefore?* [R.V. *how*]. See the lexicon under **אֵי**.

§ 100. Adverbs.

On demonstrative adverbs cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 323; on interrogative adverbs, *ibid.*, i. 328; on adverbs in general, i. 492 ff.

a 1. The negative **לֹא** *not*, and a few particles of place and time, as **שָׁם** *there*, are of obscure origin.

b 2. Forms of other parts of speech, which are used adverbially without further change, are—

(*a*) Substantives with prepositions, e.g. **בְּמֶאֱדָר** (with might) *very*; **לְבַד** *alone* (prop. *in separation*, Fr. *à part*), with suffix **לְבַדִּי** *I alone*; **מִבֵּית** *from within, within*; cf. also **בְּאַחַד** (as one) *together*, **לְעֵמֶת** and **מִלְעֵמֶת** (originally *in connexion with*) *near to, corresponding to, like*, &c., cf. § 161 b.

c (*b*) Substantives in the accusative (the adverbial case of the Semites, § 118 m), cf. **τὴν ἀρχήν**, **δωρεάν**, e.g. **מֶאֱדָר** (might) *very*, **אִפְסָם** (cessation) *no more*, **הַיּוֹם** (the day) *to-day* (cf. § 126 b), **מָחָר**¹ *to-morrow*, **יַחַד** (union) *together*. Several of these continued to be used, though rarely, as substantives, e.g. **קָבִיב**, plur. **קָבִיבִים** and **קָבִיבוֹת**, *circuit*, as adverb

¹ Generally derived from the *ptcp.* **מִאֲחָר** *m^ohār* (= *m^oohār*) and hence to be read *mōhār* (cf. **מִחָרָת** *morning*); but according to P. Haupt (notes to Esther, p. 159) from **אֲחָר** *יום*.

circum, around; others have quite ceased to be so used, e.g. פֶּכֶר (length) *long ago* [Aram.: only in Ec.]; עוֹד (repetition, duration) *again or further*.

(c) Adjectives, especially in the feminine (corresponding to the *d* Indo-Germanic neuter), e.g. רִאשׁוֹנָה *primum, formerly* (more frequently בְּרִאשׁוֹנָה, also לְרִאשׁוֹנָה); רַבָּה and רַבַּת [both rare] *multum, much, enough*; נִפְלְאוֹת *wonderfully* (properly *mirabilibus*, sc. *modis*), יְהוּדִית *Jewish*, i. e. in the Jewish language.

(d) Verbs in the infinitive absolute, especially in *Hiph'el*, which *e* are likewise to be regarded as accusatives (§ 113 h), e.g. הִרְבָּה (prop. *a multiplying*) *much* [frequent], לְהִרְבָּה [rare and late] *in multitude*; הִשָּׁבַח (mane faciendo) *early*; הִעָרַב (vespere faciendo) *in the evening*.

(e) Pronouns and numerals, e.g. יְהִי (prop. *there=at this place*) *here, f* הִנֵּה *here, hither* (also of time, עַד-הִנֵּה *till now*, cf. the late and rare עָדָן and עֶרְבָּה = עֶרְבֵּהוּ); אַחַת, שְׁתַּיִם, שֶׁבַע, מֵאָה *once, twice, seven times, a hundred times*; שֵׁנִית *for the second time*.

3. Some adverbs are formed by the addition of formative syllables *g* (most frequently מֶ-_ת) to substantives or adjectives, e.g. אֱמָנָם and אֱמָנָה *truly* (from אֱמֶן *truth*); חִנָּם (by favour) *gratis* (from חֵן *gratia*); רִיקָם *in vain, frustra*, but also *empty* (from רִיק *empty, emptiness, vanum*), Ru 1²¹, parallel with the fem. מְלֵאָה *full*; יוֹמָם *by day* (from יוֹם)¹; with *ô* in the last syllable, פִּתְאֻם, for פִּתְעָם, *in a twinkling, suddenly* (from פָּתַע *a twinkling*, the *ô* being probably obscured from an original *ä*).²—Moreover, cf. אֶחָדָרְבִּית *backward*, and קָרְבִּית *darkly attired*, Mal 3¹⁴. In both these cases, the formative syllable *an* has been first attached to the stem, and then the feminine ending *ith*, which is elsewhere used to form adverbs, has been added to it.

The termination מֶ-_ת occurs also in the formation of substantives, e.g. הֹלָם *porch*, and hence the above adverbs may equally well be regarded as nouns used adverbially, so that מֶ-_ת, מֶ-_ת, would correspond to הֹלָם, הֹלָם (§ 85, Nos. 53, 54), cf. בְּפִתְאֻם (with prep.) *suddenly*, 2 Ch 29³⁶. According to others, this *am* is an obsolete accusative ending, to be compared with the indeterminate accusative sing. in *än* in Arabic.

¹ Is this מֶ-_ת an instance of the locative or temporal termination (cf. especially צֶהְרֶם) mentioned in § 88 c? Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. p. 721, considers יוֹמָם a secondary substantival form (used adverbially like לַיְלָה *noctū*), corresponding to the Phœnician and Aramaic יוֹמָם, Syr. 'imāmā; cf. on the other hand, König, ii. 255, who follows Olshausen in maintaining that the *ām* is an adverbial termination.

² דוֹמָם *silent* (an adjective in Is 47⁵, La 3²⁶; a substantive in Hb 2¹⁹), which was formerly included under this head, is better taken, with Barth (*Nominalbildung*, p. 352, Rem. 2), as a participle formed like שׁוֹכֵב, עוֹלֵל, so that דוֹמָם (perhaps assimilated to דוֹמָה) stands for original דוֹמָם.

i 4. A number of forms standing in very close relation to the demonstrative pronoun may be regarded as primitive adverbs, since they arise directly from a combination of demonstrative sounds. Some of these have subsequently suffered great mutilation, the extent of which, however, can now very rarely be ascertained with certainty. Such are e.g. *אָז* then, *הֵנָּה* here (according to Barth, *Sprachwiss. Abhandlungen*, p. 16, formed from the two demonstrative elements *hin* and *na*), *כֵּן*, *כֵּכָה* thus (cf. *אֵיכָה*, *אֵיכָכָה* how?), *אָז* only, *אֲזַי* truly (on all these adverbs, see the Lexicon), and especially the interrogative *הֵ* (*Hē interrogativum*), e.g. *הֲלֹא* (Dt 3¹¹ *הֲלֹה*) *nonne?*, *הֲגַם* *num etiam?* This *Hē interrogativum* is perhaps shortened from *הָל*, which is still used in Arabic, and, according to the view of a certain school of Masoretes, occurs also in Hebrew in Dt 32⁶.¹

k The *ה* interrogative takes—(1) *Ḥaṭeph-Pathah* generally before non-gutturals (even before *ר*), with a firm vowel, e.g. *הֲשֵׁמָתָהּ* hast thou set? see the interrogative clause, § 150 c (*הֵיטֵב* Lv 10¹⁹ is an exception).

l (2) Before a consonant with *Ṣwā*, usually *Pathah* without a following *Dageš forte*, e.g. *הֲבִרְכָה* Gn 27³⁸, cf. 18¹⁷, 29⁵, 30¹⁵, 34³¹; less frequently (in about ten passages), *Pathah* with a following *Dageš forte*, e.g. *הֲבִרְכָהּ* *num in via*, Ez 20⁸⁰, *הֲלָבָן* Gn 17¹⁷, 18²¹, 37³², Nu 13¹⁹, Jb 23⁶; even in *ר*, 1 S 10²⁴, 17²⁵, 2 K 6⁸².

m (3) Before gutturals, not pointed with either *Qameṣ* or *Ḥaṭeph-Qameṣ*, it takes *Pathah*, e.g. *הֲאֵלֶיךָ* shall I go?, *הֲאֵתָהּ* *num tu?*, *הֲאֵם* *num si*; *הֲאֵרְצָהּ* Mal 1¹³; also in Ju 6³¹ read *הֲאֵתָם* (not *הֵאֵת*), likewise *הֵ* in Ju 12⁵, Jer 8¹⁹, Neh 6¹¹.—In *הֲאֵיִשׁ* Nu 16²², the Masora intends the article; read *הֵאֵיִשׁ*, and cf. Dt 20¹⁹; in Ec 3²¹ read *הֵעֲלָהּ* and *הֵיִרְרָתָהּ*; the article is a correction due to doctrinal considerations.

n (4) The *ה* takes *Ṣeḡhol* before gutturals pointed with *Qameṣ* or (as in Ju 9²⁷) *Ḥaṭeph-Qameṣ*, e.g. *הֲאֵמָחֹר* Mi 2⁷; *הֲאֵלֶיךָ* Jb 21⁴; *הֲהֵיִתָהּ* Jo 1²; *הֲהֵיִשָּׁב* Gn 24⁵ (cf. the analogous instances in § 22 c, § 35 k, § 63 k). The place of this interrogative particle is always at the beginning of the clause [but see Jb 34³¹, Neh 13²⁷, Jer 22¹⁵, where one or more words are prefixed for emphasis].

o 5. Some adverbs occur also in connexion with suffixes, thus *יֵשֶׁךְ* thou art there, 3rd sing. masc. *יֵשְׁנֹו*² (but see note below), 2nd plur. masc. *יֵשְׁכֶם*; *אֵינִי* I am not, 2nd sing. fem. *אֵינָהּ*, 3rd sing. fem. *אֵינֶיהָ*, 2nd plur. *אֵינֶכֶם*, 3rd plur. masc. *אֵינָם*.—Also *עוֹדֵנִי* I am yet (*עוֹדִי* only in *בְּעוֹדִי* and *מִעוֹדִי*, *עוֹדֶךָ*, *עוֹדֶהּ*, *עוֹדֵינוּ* (La 4¹⁷ *Qeṭē*; *עוֹדֵינָהּ*

¹ The separation of the *ה* at the beginning of Dt 32⁶, expressly noticed by Qimḥi (ed. Rittenb., p. 40 b) as an unique instance, is perhaps a protest against admitting a particle *הָל*.

² This form, which occurs in Dt 29¹⁴, 1 S 14³⁹, 23²⁹, Est 3⁸, is textually very doubtful, and cannot be supported by the equally doubtful *קִבְּנוּ* (for *קִבְּנוּ*) Nu 23¹³. Most probably, with Stade, *Gramm.*, § 370 b, and P. Haupt, *SBOT*. Numbers, p. 57, line 37, we should read *יֵשְׁנֹו*.

Keth.; the oriental school [see above, p. 38, note 2] recognize only the reading עוֹרֵינוּ, עוֹרָם.—אֵיכָּה where art thou?, אֵי where is he?, אֵימ where are they? The same applies to הֵן (הֵן) and הִנֵּה behold! (prop. here, here is; see § 105 b), only in Gn 19² הִנֵּה-נָא; with suffixes, הִנֵּנִי, once הִנֵּנִי (Gn 22⁷ with *Munah*), in pause הִנֵּנִי behold me (here am I), הִנֵּךְ (pause הִנֵּךְ ψ 139⁸), הִנֵּךְ, הִנֵּךְ, and הִנֵּהוּ [both very rare], הִנֵּנוּ (behold us), and הִנֵּנּוּ (in pause הִנֵּנּוּ), הִנֵּכֶם, הִנֵּם; [see more fully in the Lexicon, p. 243].

The usual explanation of these suffixes (especially of the forms with *Nún energicum*) as verbal suffixes, which ascribes some power of verbal government even to forms originally substantival (e.g. יֵשֶׁנּוּ there is, he is), is at least inadmissible for forms (like אֵי, אֵיכָּה, אֵימ) which are evidently connected with noun-suffixes; even for the other forms it is questionable. Brockelmann suggests that the ך in connexion with these particles is a survival from הנה corresponding to the Arab. 'anna which introduces dependent clauses.

101. Prepositions.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 494 ff.

1. All words, which by usage serve as prepositions, were originally *a* substantives, viz.:

(a) Substantives in the accusative and in the construct state, so that the noun governed by them is to be considered as in the genitive, and in Arabic actually has the genitive ending, cf. in German *statt dessen*, *kraft dessen*, in Greek *τούτου χάριν*, in Latin *huius rei causa*, or *gratia*, *montis instar*.¹ Cf. אַחֲרֵי (hinder part*) behind, after (*Mit'el* in אַחֲרֵי בֵּן Lv 14³⁶, Dt 21¹³, 1 S 10⁵; אַחֲרֵי 2 Ch 32⁹); אֵצֶל (side) close by; בֵּין (intermediate space*) between; בֵּעֵר, בֵּעֵר (distance²) behind, around; וּלְתַי, or with *Hireq compaginis* וּלְתַי (removal, want) except; עַל (purpose) on account of; מִלְּ (only in Dt 1¹) before, over against; מִן (separation; cf. § 119 v) from, out of; לְפָנֶיךָ (coming in front, that which is over against) before, over against; עַד (progress, duration*) during, until; עַל (height, upper part*) upon, over; עִם (connexion?) with; it is doubtful whether this is to be derived from the same stem as עִמָּה, לְעִמָּה near, beside, like; תַּחַת (under part*) under, instead of.

(b) Substantives in the construct state, but to be regarded as in the *b* genitive, since they depend on prepositions (especially the inseparable), e.g. לְפָנֶי (in the face of*) before; לְפִי, כְּפִי (according to the mouth,

¹ In the examples which follow, the meaning of the noun is added in parentheses, and, when it is actually in use [though it is mostly in such cases very rare], is marked with an asterisk.—On a similar use in other languages, see W. von Humboldt, *Über die Kavisprache*, iii, p. 621.

² So also J. Hoch de Long, *Die hebr. Präpos.* בֵּעֵר, Lpz. 1905.

i. e. the command of*) according to; בְּנִלְל (in the concern of) on account of; לְמַעַן (for the purpose of) on account of.

- c 2. Substantives used adverbially very frequently become prepositions in this way, e.g. בְּלִי, בְּבָלִי, מְבָלִי, בְּאִין, בְּאַפִּם (with cessation) without, בְּעוֹר (in the duration of) during; בְּרִי, בְּרִי (according to the requirement of) for, according to.

§ 102. Prefixed Prepositions.

- a 1. Of the words mentioned in § 101, מִן from, out of, frequently occurs as a prefix (§ 99 c), with its *Nûn* assimilated to the following consonant (by means of *Dageš forte*), e.g. מִן־עֵר out of a forest.
- b Rem. The separate מִן (always with a following *Maqqeph*) is usual (but not necessary, cf. Ju 20¹⁴ with verse 15, Ez 43⁶, &c.) only before the article, e.g. מִן־הָאָרֶץ, and sometimes occurs before the softer consonants, e.g. מִן־אֶזְרָא Jer 44¹⁸, מִן־בְּנֵי Jo 1¹², 1 Ch 5¹⁸; cf. Ex 18¹⁴, Lv 1¹⁴, 14³⁰, Ju 7²³, 10¹¹, 19¹⁶, ψ 104⁷ (2 K 23³⁶ before ר; also before ק in ψ 18⁴⁹), and elsewhere in the later books (as in Aramaic)¹; there is besides a poetic by-form מִנִּי (cf. § 90 m) and מִנִּי Is 30¹¹. Its form is most commonly מִי with a following *Dageš*, which may, however, be omitted in letters which have *Šewā* (cf. § 20 m). With a following י the מ is, as a rule, contracted to מִי, e.g. מִי־י = מִי־י or מִי־י (but cf. מִי־שֵׁנִי Dn 12²; מִי־שָׁתֵּד 2 Ch 20¹¹); before gutturals it becomes מִ (according to § 22 c), e.g. מִאֲרָם, מִעַם; before ה the מ occurs with the guttural virtually sharpened in מִחוּץ on the outside, and in מִחוּט Gn 14²³; before ה the מִ occurs with the guttural virtually sharpened in מִהוּת (cf. § 28 b and § 63 q. The closed syllable here is inconsistent with the required virtual sharpening of the ה; probably מִהוּת is merely due to the analogy of לְהוּת); similarly Is 14³ before ר; but in 1 S 23²⁸, 2 S 18¹⁶ מִדֶּרֶךְ is to be read, according to § 22 s.
- c 2. There are also three other particles, the most commonly used prepositions and the particle of comparison, which have been reduced by abbreviation (§ 99 c) to a single prefixed consonant with *Šewā* (but see below, and § 103 e), viz.:
- בְּ [poet. בְּמוֹ] in, at, with.
- לְ [poet. לְמוֹ] towards, (belonging) to, for, Lat. *ad*.
- כְּ [poet. כְּמוֹ] like, as, according to (no doubt the remnant of a substantive with the meaning of *matter, kind, instar*).
- d With regard to the pointing it is to be observed that—

(a) The *Šewā mobile*, with which the above prefixes are usually pronounced, has resulted from the weakening of a short vowel (an original *ä*, according to f)²; the short vowel is regularly retained before *Šewā*: before *Šewā simplex*

¹ König, *Einleitung ins A. T.*, p. 393 (cf. also the almost exhaustive statistics in his *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 292 ff.), enumerates eight instances of מִן before a word without the article in 2 Samuel and Kings, and forty-five in Chronicles.

² Jerome (see Siegfried, *ZAW.* iv. 79) almost always represents בְּ by *ba*.

in the form of an *i*, attenuated from *ā*: before a *Ḥateph* the prefix takes the vowel of the *Ḥateph*, e. g. לְפֵרִי for *fruit*, בְּאַרִי as a *lion*, בְּעֵנִי *bō'ni*, in *affliction* (sometimes with the syllable subsequently closed, cf. § 28 *b*, and the infinitives with ל § 63 *i*): before weak consonants it follows the rule given in § 24 *c*, e. g. לְיְהוָה for *to* לִי. When the prefixes בּ, י, ו, ה, ל precede אֱלֹהִים *God*, the *S^eghôl* and *Ḥateph S^eghôl* regularly coalesce in *Šērê*, e. g. בְּאַלְהִים, &c., for בְּאַלִי; so with suffixes וְאַלְהֵינוּ, &c. (once also in the sing. לְאַלְהֵוָה Hb 1¹¹); also regularly לְאָמַר *to say*, for לְאָמַר, see § 23 *d*.

(*b*) When the prefixes precede the article, the ה is almost always dropped, *e* and they take its vowel. See further in § 35 *n*.

(*c*) Immediately before the tone-syllable, i. e. before monosyllables and dissyllables with the tone on the penultima (in the fore-tone), they take *Qames* *f* (undoubtedly a lengthening of an original *ā*, cf. § 26 *e*, § 28 *a*), but only in the following cases:

(*aa*) ל before infinitives of the above-mentioned forms, as לָתֵת *to give*, לָרִין *to judge*, לָבוּ *to plunder*, לָזוּ *to shear*, לָחַג *to keep a festival*, לָצֶרֶת *to bring forth*, לָלֶכֶת *to go*, לָקַחַת *to take*, except when the infinitive (as a *nomen regens*) is closely connected with another word (especially its subject, § 115 *e*), and consequently, as being in a sort of *constr. state*, loses the principal tone, e. g. לְיָצֵאת Ex 19¹, לְשַׁבֵּת Gn 16⁸, and so always לְבֹא Nu 13²¹, &c. (in such cases as לְתַתְּחֹרֵב Ex 5²¹ the *ā* is protected by the secondary tone; before infinitives of verbs *ע"ו*, the ל is retained even in close connexion; cf. Ez 21^{20,25}, 22³);

(*bb*) before many pronominal forms, e. g. בְּיָהּ (so also in 1 S 21¹⁰; not בְּיָהּ), *g* לָוִהּ, בְּיָהּ, לְוֹאֵת (in close connexion, however, לְוֹאֵת Gn 2²³; בְּוֹאֵת Gn 45²³); בְּאַלְהֵי as *these*; and especially בְּכֶם, לְכֶם, בְּכֶם, בְּהֶם and בְּהֶם, לְהֶם, בְּהֶם, (בְּהֶם), see § 103 *e*;

(*cc*) ל before monosyllables or fore-toned nouns in such combinations as *h* לְפֶה פֶה *mouth to mouth*, 2 K 10²¹, בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם *between waters and waters*, Gn 1⁶; לְטָרָה for *a trouble*, Is 1¹⁴, but always before the principal pause. The instructive example in Dt 17⁸ also shows that the punctuation ל is only possible with at least the lesser pause after it; in Is 28^{10,13} the ל is twice repeated, even before the small and smallest disjunctives;

(*dd*) in certain standing expressions, which have become stereotyped almost *i* as adverbs, e. g. לְעֶד *to eternity*, לְרַב *in multitude*, לְבִטָּח *in security*, לְנֶצַח *to eternity*, but לְנֶצַח נְצָחִים *to all eternity*, Is 34¹⁰. Cf. also לְנַפְשׁ *for the dead*, Lv 19²⁸, Nu 5², 9¹⁰.

(*d*) With the interrogative מָה they are pointed as in בְּמָה; in *pause* and *k* before א as in בְּמָה *by what?* (before a following relative clause, as in Ec 3²², בְּמָה; cf. Delitzsch, *Jesaja*, 4th ed., on Is 2²²); בְּמָה *how much?* but also בְּמָה 1 K 22¹⁶, in close connexion, and at a greater distance from the *pause*. The *S^eghôl* in these forms arises from a modification of the original *ā*, while the מ is sharpened in order to maintain the original *ā* of the prefixes.

When ל (prop. *la*) is united to מָה, it takes, according to § 49 *f, g*, the form לְמָה (Jb 7²⁰ לְמָה, 1 S 1⁸ לְמָה, all *Mil'el*, and hence the *ā* in the tone is lengthened to *ā*) *for what? why?* Before the gutturals א, ה, ע, לְמָה is used for euphonic reasons (exceptions 1 S 28¹⁵, 2 S 14³¹, Jer 15¹⁸, before ה; 2 S 2²²,

ψ 49⁶, before א); לָמָּה, however, remains before ה. Before letters which are not gutturals, לָמָּה is found in ψ 42¹⁰, 43² (immediately after a tone-syllable).

m Rem. The divine name יְהוָה, which has not its original vowels (יְהוָה) but those of אֲדָנִי (see § 17 c), except that the י has simple not compound *Sewa*, takes the prefixes also, after the manner of אֲדָנִי, thus וְיְהוָה, וְיְהוָה, בְּיְהוָה, בְּיְהוָה (since they are to be read וְאֲדָנִי, וְאֲדָנִי, בְּאֲדָנִי, בְּאֲדָנִי); for the א of אֲדָנִי, as of אֲדָנִי, אֲדָנִים, &c. (see below), quiesces after the prefixes ב, ב, ל, ו, but is audible after מ (for מן), ש, (no instance in the O. T.), and ה (in הָאֲדָנִים Dt 10¹⁷, ψ 136³, the article, not ה interrog., is intended; the only example with ה interrog., Jer 8¹⁹, is to be pointed הִיְהוָה, i.e. הָאֲדָנִי, not הִיְהוָה). Hence the rule, מֹשֶׁה מוֹצֵא מֹשֶׁה מֹשֶׁה brought out (i.e. מ, ש, ה make the א audible), וְכָלֵב מְבִיֵּא and Caleb brought in (i.e. ו, כ, ל, ב allow it to quiesce).¹—As regards the other plural forms of אֲדָנִי, elision of the א always takes place after ב, ו, ב, ל, except in the form אֲדָנִי, thus לְאֲדָנִי, לְאֲדָנִי, &c.; but לְאֲדָנִי, &c., לְאֲדָנִי, &c., לְאֲדָנִי, &c.

§ 103. Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes and in the Plural Form.

a 1. As all prepositions were originally nouns (§ 101) in the accusative, they may be united with the noun-suffixes (§ 91 b-l), e.g. אֵצֶל (prop. at my side) *by me*, אֵתִי (in my proximity) *with me*, בְּתוֹכָם (in their place) *instead of them*, like the Latin *mea causa*, *for my sake*.

b Rem. 1. The preposition אֵת (usually אֶת־) *near, with*, is distinguished from אֵת (see below, and § 117 a, note 4), the sign of the definite accusative (§ 117 a), in its connexion with suffixes, by a difference of pointing, the former making אֵתִי, אֵתְךָ, in pause אֶתְךָ, 2nd fem. אֶתְךָ (Is 54¹⁰ אֶתְךָ), אֶתָּה, אֶתָּה, אֶתְּכֶם, אֶתְּכֶם (also in the later books, especially in Kings, and always in Jer. and Ezek., incorrectly אֹתִי *with me*; מֵאֹתְךָ *from thee*, 1 K 20²⁵; מֵאֹתוֹ *from him*, 1 K 22⁷; אִתָּם *with them*), while the latter retains its *ô* (obscured from *â*) before the light suffixes, but before grave suffixes is pointed with *S'ghôl*. This *S'ghôl* is to be explained, with Praetorius, *ZDMG*. lv. 369 f., as the modification of an *â* which again was shortened from original *â* (in 'âthî, 'âthô, &c.) in a closed syllable ('âth-hem, &c.). The same shortening and modification of the original *â* takes place before words in close connexion, hence אֶתְּכֶם, &c. When not in close connexion, the toneless אֵת becomes tone-long אֵת, e.g. אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם Gn 1¹. Hence the following forms arise:—

	Sing.		Plur.
1.	אֵתִי <i>me</i> .		אֵתָנוּ <i>us</i> .
2.	{ m. אֵתְךָ, pause אֶתְךָ } <i>thee</i> .		אֵתְכֶם <i>you</i> .
	{ f. אֵתְךָ }	
3.	{ m. אֵתוֹ <i>him</i> .		אֵתָם, rarely אֵתָהֶם }
	{ f. אֵתָהּ <i>her</i> .		אֵתָהֶן, rarely אֵתָן } <i>them</i> .

¹ Another *vox memor.* is כֻּלְּבוֹ נֶעְלָם *all is hidden in him*.

Less common are the *plene* forms אֹתִי, אֹתְךָ (Nu 22³³ אֹתְכָה before ה), אֹתְךָ (Ex 29³⁵ אֹתְכָה), אֹתוֹ, אֹתָהּ, אֹתָנִי, אֹתָם. Moreover, for אֹתְכֶם we find אֹתְכֶם Jos 23¹⁵; for אֹתָם, five times אֹתְהֶם (Gn 32¹, Ex 18²⁰, &c.), and in Ez 23⁴⁵ אֹתְהֶם; for אֹתָהּ (Gn 19⁸, &c. [13 times]), אֹתָן (only found in Ez 16⁵⁴; 35²⁶ אֹתְנָה; 34²¹ אֹתְנָה), and אֹתָהּ Ez 23⁴⁷.—No instance of the 2nd fem. plur. אֹתְכֵן occurs in the O. T.; in Cant. 2⁷, &c., אֹתְכֶם is used instead.

2. The preposition עִם with (with suffixes on the model of stems עָמִי, עָמְךָ, עָמְךָ [1 S 12⁶ עִמָּכָה], in pause עִמָּךְ; 2nd fem. עִמָּךְ; עִמּוֹ; עִמָּה) is united with the suffixes נִי, כֶּם, and הֶם by a (pretonic) *Qames*, which causes the sharpening of the *Mēm* to be distinctly audible: עִמָּנִי, עִמָּכֶם, עִמָּהֶם (so in Nu 22¹², Dt 29¹⁶, both in principal pause, and often in very late passages, otherwise עִמִּי is generally used). In the first person, besides עִמִּי, we also find עִמָּדִי (probably from original עִנְדִי; cf. Arab. *inda*, beside, with).

3. It is but seldom that prepositions occur with verbal suffixes, as תַּחֲתָי d 2 S 22^{37.40.43} (for which ψ 18^{37.40.48} תַּחֲתָי, תַּחֲתָנָה Gn 2²¹ and בְּעֶרְנִי ψ 139¹¹ (here probably for the sake of the rhyme with יְשׁוּעָי).¹

2. When pronominal suffixes are added to the prefixes (§ 102), there e appears occasionally, especially in the case of the shorter suffixes, an endeavour to lengthen the preposition, so as to give it more strength and body. Hence to אֶ is appended the syllable מו (see below, k), and אֶ and לֶ take at least a full vowel, אֶ and לֶ (§ 102 d, f).—The following deviations from the analogy of the noun with suffixes are to be noticed (a) in the pausal forms אֶךָ, אֶךָ, אֶתְךָ, אֶתְךָ, עִמָּךְ (not *bèkkhā*, &c.); (b) in the similar forms with the suffix of the 2nd sing. fem. (not *bèkh*, &c.) and in אֶנִּי, אֶנִּי, &c. (not *bēnū*, &c.).

(a) לֶ with Pronominal Suffixes.

f

Sing.

Plur.

- | | | | |
|----|---|--|------------|
| 1. | לִּי to me. | לָנוּ to us. | |
| 2. | { m. לְךָ (לְכָה), in pause לְךָ } to thee. | { לָכֶם } to you. | |
| | { f. לְךָ } | { [לָכֶן] ² } to you. | |
| 3. | { m. לוֹ to him. | לָהֶם, לְהֶמָּה, poet. לָמוּ. | { to them. |
| | { f. לָהּ to her. | [53 times] ³ לָהֶן, ⁴ לְהֶנָּה | |

¹ *Fini* and *bini* (in me), in vulgar Arabic for *fiyya* and *bī*, are compared by Socin. Brockelmann, ZA. xiv. 347, note 1, suggests that תַּחֲתָנִי, תַּחֲתָנָה, בְּעֶרְנִי are later formations on the model of מִפְּנֵי when its origin from the reduplication of the preposition had become obscured, but see below, m.

² לָכֶן does not occur in the O. T., by a mere accident, no doubt; Ez 13¹⁸ לָכֶנָּה.

g ק takes suffixes in the same manner: קִי, קִיךָ (Ex 7²⁰, 2 S 22³⁰, ψ 141⁸ בְּקִי, as in Gn 27³⁷, 2 S 18²², Is 3⁶ לְבִי [for 2nd fem. לְבִי the *Kethibh* occurs in 2 K 4², Ct 2¹³, cf. § 91 e]), בִּי, &c.; except that for the 3rd plur., besides בְּהֶם (especially in the later books) and בְּהֶמָּה (only in Ex 30⁴, 36¹, Hb 1¹⁶; בְּהֶמָּה only in Jer 14¹⁶), the form בָּם is also used; and for the feminine, besides בְּהֵנָּה (three times), בְּהֵנָּה is found fifteen times, and בְּהֵנָּה only in 1 S 31⁷, Is 38¹⁶, Ez 42¹⁴.—According to the Masora, לִי is found fifteen times for לוֹ (as conversely in 1 S 2¹⁶, 20² לוֹ for לִי), e.g. Ex 21⁸, 1 S 2³, Is 9², ψ 100³ (and, as has been conjectured, also Jb 41⁴); cf. Delitzsch on ψ 100³.—In Nu 32⁴², Zc 5¹¹, Ru 2¹⁴, the Masora requires לָהּ instead of לָהֶּ (in all three places before a following tone-syllable; cf. § 23 k, and the analogous cases of the loss of *Mappiq* in § 58 g, § 91 e).

h

(b) ק with Pronominal Suffixes.

	Sing.	Plur.
1.	קִמּוֹנִי ⁵ as I.	קִמּוֹנֵנוּ as we.
2.	{ m. קִמּוֹךְ ⁵ as thou. f. . . . }	{ קִמּוֹכֶם, קִמּוֹכֶם, rarely קִמּוֹכֶם } as ye. }
3.	{ m. קִמּוֹהוּ as he. f. קִמּוֹהָ as she. }	{ קִמּוֹהֶם, [קִמּוֹהָה, קִמּוֹהָה], קִמּוֹהֶם } as they. [קִמּוֹהָ], קִמּוֹהָה }

⁵ The question whether קִמּוֹל can also stand for the sing. לוֹ, which Rödiger and recently W. Diehl (*Das Pronomen pers. suff. . . des Hebr.*, p. 20 f.) and P. Haupt (*SBOT.* on Pr 23²⁰, a contraction of *la-humû*) have altogether denied, must be answered in the affirmative unless we conclude with Diehl and Haupt that all the instances concerned are due to corruptions of the text. It is true that in such places as Gn 9^{26,27}, Dt 33², Is 30⁵, ψ 73¹⁰ (all in or immediately before the principal pause; in Dt 33² with *Zaqeph qaton* at least) קִמּוֹL can be better explained as plural (in reference to collective nouns); and in Is 53⁸ for קִמּוֹL נִגַע we should read with the LXX נִגַע לְמַוֹת. On the other hand, in Is 44¹⁵ its explanation as plural would be extremely forced. Even then there would remain—presuming the traditional text to be correct—קִמּוֹL ψ 11⁷ and קִמּוֹL Jb 27²³, as well as קִמּוֹL, three times, Jb 20²³, 27²³ (beside קִמּוֹL), and especially Jb 22². In all these places the most extreme exegetical artifices can only be avoided by simply admitting a singular suffix (= קִמּוֹL, קִמּוֹL, קִמּוֹL).—On the question of the antiquity of the suffixes in קִמּוֹ see § 91 l.

⁴ The form קִמּוֹL in Ru 1¹³ is Aramaic (= *therefore*).

⁵ The use of קִי here for קִי (cf. above, d) might be due to euphonic reasons.—קִמּוֹL (defectively) only in the Pentateuch, קִמּוֹL Ex 15¹¹.

(c) מִן with Pronominal Suffixes.

i

Sing.

Plur.

1. מִפְּנֵי, poet. מִנִּי [4 times], in *pause* from us.
also מִנִּי [6 times] from me.
2. { m. מִמֶּךָ, in *pause* מִפָּנֶיךָ } from thee.
f. מִמֶּנּוּ מִפָּנָיו } from you.
3. { m. מִפְּנֵי, Jb 4¹² in *pause* מִלְּפָנָיו, [מִלְּפָנָיו, [twice],
or מִפְּנֵי: see below] from him. Jb 11²⁰ מִפְּנֵי } from
f. מִפְּנֵיהָ from her. מִלְּפָנֶיהָ [7 times] } them.

The syllable מו (in Arabic *mā* مَا = Heb. מה *what*) in בְּמוֹי (probably from כְּמוֹי) בְּמָה, prop. *according to what I, for as I*) is, in poetry, appended to the three simple prefixes ב, כ, ל, even without suffixes, so that בְּמו, כְּמו, לְמו appear as independent words, equivalent in meaning to ב, כ, ל. Poetry is here distinguished from prose by the use of longer forms; in the case of מן, on the other hand, it prefers the shorter, which resemble the Syriac and Arabic.

The form פָּהָם, enclosed in brackets above, occurs only in 2 K 17¹⁵ (in *pause*), פָּהָם only in Jer 36³² (in *pause*); פָּהָם (Baer following Qimḥi פָּהָם) only in Ez 18¹⁴. Cf. Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 234 ff.—For פָּהָם as ye, Qimḥi requires פָּהָם (invariably or only in Jb 16⁴ ?); in Jos 1¹⁵, Ju 8², Ezr 4² Baer gives פָּהָם.

With regard to מֵן with suffixes, מֵמִנִּי from me is usually explained as arising, *m* by a reduplication of מֵן, from an original מִנּוּנִי, just as מֵמִנּוּ from him, from מִנּוּ, identical in form with מֵמִנּוּ ¹ from us, from מִנּוּ-נוּ, while מֵמִנָּה from her, goes back to מִנּוּנָה. Far simpler, however, is Mayer Lambert's explanation (*REJ.* xxiii. 302 ff.), that מֵמִנִּי, &c., have arisen from מִנְנִי, &c., and that the forms of the suffixes are to be explained on the analogy of עוֹרְנִי, אֵילָנִי, מִתְחַנְנִי, &c. § 100 o.—The bracketed form מִנְהוּ, for which Baer, following Qimḥi and others, writes מֵנְהוּ, occurs only in ψ 68²⁴, and is there regarded by Delitzsch, Hupfeld, and others (following Simonis) as a substantive (מֵן = *portion*). The expression מִן-הִוא (for מֵמִנּוּ ?) Is 18^{2.7} is very strange.—מִתְחַנְנִי occurs only in Jer 10², Ec 12¹² (Jb 11²⁰ מִנְהֶם); מִנְהוּ (so Baer and Ginsburg, following the best authorities, instead of the ordinary reading מִהוּ) only in Ez 16^{47.52}.

¹ The Babylonian Masora writes מִפְּנֵי (to distinguish it from the 3rd sing.), which is justly blamed by Ibn Ezra.

n 3. Several prepositions, especially those which express relations of space and time, are (like the German *wegen*) properly plural nouns (for the reason, see § 124 a), and are, therefore, joined with the pronominal suffixes in the form of the plural *construct state*, just like other plural nouns (§ 91 g). On the other hand, the apparent connexion of **אֶל** with plural suffixes is explained from the ground-forms of those prepositions (from stems **ל"ה**) **אֵלִי** (**אֵלִי**), **עָדִי**, **עָלִי** (contracted to **אֵלַי**, **אֵלַי**, &c.).¹

o Without suffixes these prepositions are—

אֲחֵר, more frequently **אֲחֵרִי** (prop. *hinder parts*) *behind, after*.

אֶל,² poet. [4 times in Job] also **אֵלַי** (*region, direction*), *towards, to, according to*.

בֵּין (*interval*) *between*; the suffixes indicating the singular are added to the singular **בֵּין**, thus **בֵּינִי**, **בֵּינְךָ**, &c. (Gn 16⁵ **בֵּינֶיךָ**, the second *Yôdh* is, however, marked with a point as critically doubtful; **בֵּינִי**, which occurs three times, is only the Masoretic *Qerê* for **בֵּינוּ**, which is found e. g. in Gn 30³⁶). On the other hand, the suffixes indicating a plural are attached to the plural forms **בֵּינֵי** or **בֵּינוֹת**.

סָבִיב (*circuit*) *around*, as a preposition, always has the plural form, sometimes masc. **סָבִיבֶיךָ**, &c. [10 times], but much more frequently in the fem. **סָבִיבוֹת** (*surroundings*). In Ez 43¹⁷ **סָבִיב אוֹתָהּ** is a corruption of **סָבִיבוֹתָהּ**; [in 1 K 6⁵ **אֵת סָבִיב** also is so contrary to usage, that it must be due to some textual error].

עַד (*continuation, duration*, from **עָדָה**) *as far as, unto*, poet. **עָדִי** [12 times]. In Jb 32¹² **עָדִיכֶם**, with the *ā* retained in the secondary tone, is abnormal. Also in 2 K 9¹⁸ for **עָדִיכֶם** read **עָדִיכֶם**.

עַל *upon, over* (cf. the rare subst. **עָל** *height* [see Lexicon], from **עָלָה** *to ascend*), poet. **עָלַי** [40 times, and 2 *Qerê*].

תַּחַת *under* (prop. *what is beneath*). On **תַּחַתִּי**, &c.; cf. above, d.

¹ The reference of these forms to original plurals has been again expressly supported by De Lagarde, *Symnicta*, ii. 101 ff.; *Nachrichten der G. g. G.*, 1881, p. 376, cf. *Mittheilungen*, 1884, p. 63; also *GGA.* 1884, p. 280 f. According to Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii. p. 348 ff., and *Nominalbildung*, p. 375 ff., **תַּחַתֶּיךָ**, &c., was only formed on the analogy of **עָלֶיךָ**, &c., and **אֲחֵרֶיךָ**, &c., only on the analogy of **לִפְנֵי**, &c., since the real plural forms ought to be **תַּחַתֶּיךָ**, **אֲחֵרֶיךָ**, &c.; cf., however, König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 305 f.

² On the use of this particle see § 119 g.

With Suffixes.

	אֲחֵרִי	בֵּינִי	סְבִיבוֹתַי	תַּחְתִּי	אֵלַי	עָדַי	עָלַי p
1 Sing.	(after me)	(between me)	(around me)	(beneath me)	(to me)	(unto me)	(on me)
2 S. m.	אֲחֵרֶיךָ	בֵּינֶיךָ	סְבִיבוֹתֶיךָ & סְבִיבֶיךָ	תַּחְתֶּיךָ	אֵלֶיךָ	עָדֶיךָ	עָלֶיךָ
2 S. f.	אֲחֵרֶיךָ		סְבִיבוֹתֶיךָ & סְבִיבֶיךָ		אֵלֶיךָ		עָלֶיךָ
3 S. m.	אֲחֵרָיו	בֵּינוֹ	סְבִיבוֹתָיו & סְבִיבוֹ	תַּחְתָּיו	אֵלָיו	עָדָיו	עָלָיו
3 S. f.	אֲחֵרֶיהָ		סְבִיבוֹתֶיהָ & סְבִיבֶיהָ	תַּחְתֶּיהָ	אֵלֶיהָ	עָדֶיהָ	עָלֶיהָ
Plur.	אֲחֵרֵינוּ & בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ ¹	בֵּינֵינוּ	סְבִיבוֹתֵינוּ	תַּחְתֵּינוּ	אֵלֵינוּ		עָלֵינוּ
Pl. m.	אֲחֵרֵיכֶם	בֵּינֵיכֶם	סְבִיבוֹתֵיכֶם	תַּחְתֵּיכֶם	אֵלֵיכֶם	עָדֵיכֶם	עָלֵיכֶם
Pl. m.	אֲחֵרֵיהֶם	בֵּינֵיהֶם & בֵּינוֹתָם	סְבִיבוֹתֵיהֶם & סְבִיבוֹתָם	תַּחְתֵּיהֶם usually תַּחְתָּם	אֵלֵיהֶם & אֵלֵינוּ ²	[עָדֵיהֶם]	עָלֵיהֶם [עָלֵינוּ ²]
Pl. f.	אֲחֵרֵיהֶן			תַּחְתֵּיהֶן	אֵלֵיהֶן & אֵלָהֶן		עָלֵיהֶן

§ 104. *Conjunctions.*

1. The conjunctions serve to connect sentences, and to express their *a* relations one to another. They may be either—

(a) Original pronouns, e.g. the demonstrative בֵּי that, because, for.

(b) Original substantives, which afterwards were reduced to the rank of pronouns, adverbs, or conjunctions; so perhaps אֲשֶׁר (see § 36), which is sometimes used to express the general idea of relation, sometimes as a relative pronoun (properly a demonstrative), but in many cases stands simply for בֵּי; also אֵל (nothing), that not; כִּי that not (the Greek *μή* of prohibition), &c. To these may be added the adverbial combination of substantives with prepositions, e.g. בְּתוֹכָם.

¹ As Mayer Lambert observes, usage (cf. esp. Gn 26²⁸) distinguishes between the two forms: בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ means *between us and you*, whereas בֵּינֵינוּ (Jos 22^{25, 27, 28} before וּבֵינֵיכֶם) means *between us on the one side*.

² The poetical form אֵלֵינוּ only in ψ 2⁵; עָלֵינוּ, on which see note 3 on f, 12 times [viz. Dt 32²³, ψ 5¹², 55¹⁶, 64⁹, Jb 6¹⁶, 20²³, 21¹⁷, 22², 27²³, 29²², 30^{2, 5}].

(in the not yet) earlier, before, for which מִקִּדְמָה is also used. On the combination of two particles to express complex ideas (e.g. אֲחֵר־כִּי added to this, that=*much more*), see the Syntax, § 163 f.

- b (c) Prepositions, which with the addition of the conjunction אֲשֶׁר or כִּי together form one single conjunction, e.g. אֲשֶׁר עַל because, prop. on account of the fact that; אֲחֵר אֲשֶׁר, and more frequently אֲחֵר־אֲשֶׁר, after that; כִּי אֲשֶׁר according as (with כִּי); עַל־כֵּן אֲשֶׁר and עַל־כֵּן אֲשֶׁר in consequence of the fact that, for the reason that, because. Sometimes, however, the conjunction in such cases is omitted, and the preposition itself used as a conjunction, e.g. עַל־ (for אֲשֶׁר־עַל) although, Jb 16¹⁷.

So, at any rate, according to our linguistic principles. It would, however, be more correct to say, that instead of the intermediary אֲשֶׁר the whole of the succeeding sentence is regarded as *one* substantival idea, under the immediate government of the preposition. In the same way, all prepositions governing the gerund in English may be paraphrased by conjunctions with the finite verb, see §§ 114 and 115, *passim*.

- c 2. Besides those already mentioned, there are certain other small words now used as conjunctions, of which the derivation or original meaning is altogether obscure, thus אוּ or, אִם if (also or before the second member of a double question), אֵף also, וְ and, and others.

- d Rem. The pointing of the וְ (originally ׀, as still before *Hateph Pathah* and—with a following *Dageš forte*—in *wāw consecutive* of the imperfect; cf. § 49 f) is in many respects analogous to that of the prefixes בְּ, כִּי, לְ (§ 102 d-i), but as being a weak consonant, the *wāw copulative* has some further peculiarities:

(a) Usually it takes simple *Šewā* (וְ).

(b) Before words which begin with a guttural having a compound *Šewā*, it takes the vowel with which the *Šewā* is compounded (according to § 28 b), e.g. וְחָכָם and be thou wise, וְעֲבָדִים and servants, וְיָצוֹן and strength, וְאָכַל and eat thou, וְחֲלִי and sickness. On וְאֱלֹהִים, וְאֱלֹהֵי, &c., see § 102 d; on וְאֲרָנִי, &c., see § 102 m; on such cases as וְעֶצֶר Jb 4², cf. § 28 b.

- e (c) Before words with simple *Šewā* under the first consonant (except in the cases under f), the *Wāw* becomes the vowel *û* (cf. § 26 a), e.g. וְלִכְלֹ and to all, so also (except in the case under g) before the cognate labials בּ, מּ, פּ, hence וְמִלֶּךְ. On the cases in which simple *Šewā* has become a *Hateph* after וְ copulative (e.g. וְהָבָה Gn 2¹²), cf. § 10 g.

- f (d) With a following וְ the וְ coalesces to form וְי according to § 24 b, as וְיָהּ and let him be. On the peculiar punctuation of the *wāw copulative* before forms with initial *Šewā* from הָיָה to be and חָיָה to live (e.g. וְהָיָה Jos 8⁴, וְחָיָה Gn 20⁷), cf. § 63 q.

- g (e) Immediately before the tone-syllable it frequently takes *Qames*, like בְּ, כִּי, לְ (see § 102 f), but in most cases only at the end of a sentence or clause (but cf. also וְבֹא 2 K 22⁸⁰), e.g. וְמָת Ex 21¹² (on the other hand, in verse 20

וּמַתְּנוּ is in closer logical connexion with what follows); 2 K 7⁴ וּמַתְּנוּ שֵׁם; and וּמַתְּנוּ; Ru 3⁸ וְסִכְתָּ; ψ 10¹⁵ וְרָע; 1 S 9⁴ וְאַחַן; 2 S 13²⁶ וְלֹא; Ez 47⁹ וְחַי; cf. also (with *Tiphhu*) Gn 33¹³, 2 S 15¹². The very frequent connexion of nouns expressing kindred ideas, by means of וְ, is due simply to considerations of rhythm, for even in such cases the *Wāw* must immediately precede the tone-syllable, which must be marked by a disjunctive accent, e. g. הָיוּ וְבָהוּ Gn 1², יוֹם וְלַיְלָה Gn 8²² (see also the previous examples); Gn 13¹⁴ (thrice); Ex 25³ וְכִסָּף; ψ 96⁷ וְעוֹ; פְּבוֹד וְעוֹ ψ 76⁷; Gn 7¹³ וְיָפֶת וְיָחֶם; 1 K 21¹⁰ אִישׁ-וְאִישׁ at the end of the verse, but in ψ 87⁵ אִישׁ וְאִישׁ in spite of the *Dehi* with the second אִישׁ, because it is closely connected with the following predicate. Also with three words פָּחַד וּפָחַת וּפָחַ Is 24¹⁷. On the other hand, the rapid pronunciation וְ occurs before a conjunctive accent (and, when farther removed from the principal pause, even with the smaller disjunctives, in spite of a following tone-syllable), e. g. צֶאֱן וְעֶבֶד Gn 32⁶; cf. Gn 31⁴⁰, Lv 7²³, Dt 2²¹, and among the examples given above, Gn 7¹³ and ψ 76⁷. (Exceptions: וְקִרְמָה Gn 13¹⁴, where evidently the וְ is intended to ensure the slow and solemn recitation of the promise, but also וְיִי Jos 15⁵⁵, וְעֵתָר 19⁷, וְכֶזֶן 19²⁵, all immediately before the pause.) For the same rhythmical reason וְ (not וְ) is used regularly with certain monosyllables which, by their nature, lean more closely upon the following word, thus וְהָ, וְאֵת, וְגַם, וְלֹא (to be distinguished from וְלֹא if not, with *Zaqeph gadol*, 2 K 5¹⁷), and others.

§ 105. Interjections.

1. Among the interjections some (as in all languages) are simply *a* natural sounds, or, as it were, vocal gestures, called forth involuntarily by certain impressions or sensations, e. g. אָהָה (Ez 30² הָהָה), אָה *ah!* אָהָה *aha!* (cf. this אָה also in אָחָלִי and אָחָלִי *utinam!*), אָהָה Ex 32³¹, &c. (Gn 50¹⁷ אָהָה *ah!* (from אָה and אָה), otherwise written אָהָה 2 K 20³, Jn 1¹⁴, ψ 116⁴; also הָם (in pause הָם, even in the plural הָם *hold your peace!* Neh 8¹¹) *hush!* הוּי (Am 5¹⁶ הוּי-הוּי) *ha! woe!* אָיִי (ψ 120⁵), אָיִי (in אָיִלִּי Ec 4¹⁰; אָיִלִּי 10¹⁶) *woe!*

2. Others, however, originally expressed independent ideas, and *b* become interjections only by rapid pronunciation and by usage, e. g. הֵן (הָא) or הֵנָּה *behold!* (prop. *here*); רֵאָה *behold!* (prop. imperative); הֵבָה, plur. הֵבִי (prop. *give*, imperative of הֵב; as to the tone, cf. § 69 o), *come*, the Latin *age, agite!* לָבָה (also לָבֵה) *go*, imperative of לָבֵה with the same meaning¹; הָלֵלָה *far be it!* (prop. *ad profanum!*)

¹ רֵאָה (Dt 1⁸), הֵבָה and לָבָה are also used in connexion with the feminine and the plural, which proves that they have become quite stereotyped as interjections.

יָ (see the Lexicon) *I beseech, hear me!* נָא *pray!*¹ used to emphasize a demand, warning, or entreaty, and always placed after the expression to which it belongs.²

¹ נָא serves to express the most various shades of expression, which are discussed in the various parts of the syntax. It is used especially (a) after the *imperative*, either in commands or entreaty, see § 110 d; (b) with the *imperfect*, either in the cohortative (§ 108 b) or jussive (§ 109 b); (c) once with *perfect*, Gn 40¹⁴; (d) after various particles: הִנֵּה-נָא *behold now*; particularly after the conjunctions וְ and אֲ: אֲ-נָא *ne quaeso* and אֲ-נָא *if now*, εἴπερ, εἴποτε, *if*, in a deprecatory sense, expressive of politeness or modesty. In Nu 12¹³ נָא stands after a noun; but we ought certainly to read אֲ-נָא.— In polite language this particle is used constantly in all these ways, Gn 18^{3,4}, 19^{7,8,19}, and 50¹⁷.

² Against the usual view which regards נָא as a hortatory particle (= *up!* *come!* analogous to the original imperatives הִבֵּה and לִבֵּה and the Ethiopic *nā'ā*, properly *hither*, also *come!*), P. Haupt, in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xiii, no. 114, p. 109, justly observes that we should then expect the particle to be *prefixed* to the imperative, &c. He proposes to describe נָא as an emphatic particle. Haupt's suggested identification of this נָא with the Assyrian, Arabic, and Ethiopic particle *mā* (which is also an enclitic of emphasis), and ultimately with the interrogative *mā*, we shall not discuss here.

THIRD PART

SYNTAX¹

CHAPTER I

THE PARTS OF SPEECH

I. Syntax of the Verb.

A. USE OF THE TENSES AND MOODS.²

§ 106. *Use of the Perfect.*

The perfect serves to express actions, events, or states, which the *a* speaker wishes to represent from the point of view of completion, whether they belong to a determinate past time, or extend into the present, or, while still future, are pictured as in their completed state.

The definition formerly given here ('the perfect serves to express *completed* actions') applies, strictly speaking, only to some of the varieties of the perfect discussed under *b-p*: hence the above modification based on the arguments of Knudtzon (for the title see note 2, and cf. further § 107 *a*).

More particularly the uses of the perfect may be distinguished as follows:—

1. To represent actions, events, or states, which, after a shorter *b*

¹ Recent works on Hebrew syntax are: A. B. Davidson, *Introductory Heb. Gram.*, vol. ii, *Heb. Syntax*, Edinburgh, 1894; Ed. König, *Hist.-compar. Syntax der hebr. Sprache*, Lpz. 1897 (see above, § 3 *f*). Important contributions to Hebrew syntax are also contained in H. Reckendorf's work *Die syntakt. Verhältnisse des Arab.*, 2 pts., Leiden, 1895, 1898, of which we have already made use in § 97 *a*. Cf. also the same author's very instructive discussions *Ueber syntakt. Forschung*, Munich, 1899.

² Cf. the sketch of the tenses and moods used in Hebrew in § 40; and on the general characteristics of the perfect and imperfect see the note on § 47 *a*; also Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (Oxford, 1874; 3rd ed. 1892); Bennett, 'Notes on the Use of the Hebrew Tenses' (*Hebraica*, 1886, vols. ii, iii). A partial modification of the accepted definition of the Semitic perfect and imperfect was proposed by J. A. Knudtzon, *Om det saakaldte Perfektum og Imperfektum i Hebraisk*, Kristiania, 1890; of which a summary entitled 'Vom sogenannten Perf. und Imperf. im Hebr.' appeared in the *Transactions of the Oriental Congress at Stockholm*, section sémitique *b*, p. 73 ff. (Leiden, 1893). Cf. also Knudtzon's articles, 'Zur assyrischen und allgemein semitischen Grammatik' in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, especially vi. 422 ff. and vii. 33 ff.

or longer duration, were terminated in the past, and hence are finally concluded, viz.:

(a) Corresponding to the perfect proper in Latin and the English perfect definite, in assertions, negations, confirmations, interrogations, &c., e.g. Gn 18¹⁵ *then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed not* (לֹא צָחַקְתִּי); and he said, *Nay, but thou didst laugh* (צָחַקְתָּ); Gn 3¹¹ לֹךְ מִי הָיִיד לְךָ *who told thee . . . ?* Cf. 3^{13, 14, 17, 22}. Also pointing to some undefined time in the past, e.g. Is 66⁸ מִי־שָׁמַע בְּזֹאת *who hath (ever yet) heard such a thing?*

c Rem. In opposition to this express use of the perfect to emphasize the completion of an event, the imperfect is not infrequently used to emphasize that which is still future, e.g. Jos 1⁶ *as I was* (הָיִיתִי) *with Moses, so will I be* (אֶהְיֶה) *with thee*; Jos 1¹⁷, Ex 10¹⁴, Dt 32²¹, 1 K 2³⁸, Is 46^{4, 11}, Jo 2², Ec 1⁹.

d (b) As a simple *tempus historicum* (corresponding to the Greek *aorist*) in narrating past events, e.g. Gn 4⁴ *and Abel, he also brought* (וַהֲבִיֵא), &c.; Gn 7¹⁹ *the waters did prevail* (וַיִּבְרֹךְ), &c.; Jb 1¹ *there was a man* (אִישׁ הָיָה) *in the land of Uz, &c.*; even in relating repeated actions, 1 S 18³⁰.

e Rem. As the above examples indicate, the perfect of narration occurs especially at the head of an entire narrative (Jb 1¹; cf. Dn 2¹) or an independent sentence (e.g. Gn 7^{11, 13}), but in co-ordinate sentences, as a rule, only when the verb is separated from the copulative ו by one or more words (cf. above Gn 4⁴ and 7¹⁹). In other cases, the narrative is continued in the imperfect consecutive, according to § 111 a. The direct connexion of the narrative perfect with ו copulative (not to be confounded with the perfect consecutive proper, § 112) agrees rather with Aramaic syntax (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aram.*, § 71, 1 b). On the examples (which are in many respects doubtful) in the earlier texts, see § 112 pp-uu.

f (c) To represent actions, &c., which were already completed in the past, at the time when other actions or conditions took place (pluperfect),¹ e.g. 1 S 28³ *now Samuel was (long since) dead*² . . . and Saul had put away (וַהֲסִיר) *those that had familiar spirits . . . out of the land.* Both these statements, being as it were in parentheses, merely assign a reason for the narrative beginning at verse 6. Cf. 1 S 9¹⁵, 25²¹, 2 S 18¹⁸.—Gn 20¹³ (*for the Lord had fast closed up, &c.*); 27³⁰, 31^{19, 34}, Dt 2¹⁰; and in a negative statement, Gn 2⁵ *for the Lord God had not (up to that time) caused it to rain, &c.* This is especially frequent, from the nature of the case, in relative, causal, and temporal clauses, when the main clause contains a tense referring to the past, e.g. Gn 2² *and he rested . . . from all his work which he had made* (וַעֲשָׂה); Gn 7⁹,

¹ Cf. P. Haupt in the *Notes on Esther*, 9².

² Incorrectly, e.g. in the Vulgate, *Samuel autem mortuus est . . . et Saul abstulit magos, &c.*

19²⁷, &c.; 29¹⁰ *now when Jacob had seen Rachel* (פָּאָסַר רָאָה) . . . , *Jacob went near*, &c.; so also in clauses which express the completion or incompleteness of one action, &c., on the occurrence of another, as in Gn 24¹⁵, 27³⁰, &c.; cf. § 164 b, with the note, and c.

2. To represent actions, events, or states, which, although completed *g* in the past, nevertheless extend their influence into the present (in English generally rendered by the present):

(a) Expressing facts which were accomplished long before, or conditions and attributes which were acquired long before, but of which the effects still remain in the present (present perfect), e.g. ψ 10¹¹ הִסְתִּיר פָּנָיו *he hath hidden his face (and still keeps it hidden)*; ψ 143⁶ פִּרְשֵׁתִי *I have spread forth my hands (and still keep them spread forth)*. This applies particularly to a large number of perfects (almost exclusively of intransitive¹ verbs, denoting affections or states of the mind) which in English can be rendered only by the present, or, in the case mentioned above under *f*, by the imperfect.² Thus, יָדַעְתִּי *I know* (prop. *I have perceived, have experienced*) Jb 9², 10¹³, לֹא יָדַעְתִּי *I know not* Gn 4⁹, &c.; on the other hand, e.g. in Gn 28¹⁸, Nu 22³⁴, the context requires *I knew not*; וְזָכַרְנִי *we remember* Nu 11⁵; מֵאַנְהָה *she refuseth* Jb 6⁷; עָלָהּ *it exulteth*; שָׂמַחְתִּי *I rejoice* 1 S 2¹; בִּקֵּשׁ *he requireth* Is 1¹²; קָוִיתִי *I wait* Gn 49¹⁸, ψ 130⁵ (parallel with הוֹחֵלֶתִי); חִפְצִיתִי *I delight* ψ 40⁹ (mostly negative, Is 1¹¹, &c.); אָהַבְתִּי *I love* Gn 27⁴; שָׂנְאִתִּי *I hate* ψ 31⁷; מִאַסְתִּי *I despise* Am 5²¹; תִּעְבְּוּנִי *they abhor me* Jb 30¹⁰; בָּטַחְתִּי *I trust* ψ 25²; הִטֵּיתִי *I put my trust* ψ 31²; צִדְקָתִי *I am righteous* Jb 34⁵; פָּקַדְתִּי *I have decided to requite* 1 S 15².—We may further include a number of verbs which express bodily characteristics or states, such as גָּדַלְתָּ *thou art great* ψ 104¹; קָטַנְתִּי *I am little* Gn 32¹¹; גָּבְהוּ *they are high* Is 55⁹; רָחֲקוּ *they stand aloof* Jb 30¹⁰; טָבוּ *they are goodly* Nu 24⁵; נָאוּ *they are beautiful* Is 52⁷; זָקַנְתִּי *I am old* Gn 18¹³; יָגַעְתִּי *I am weary* ψ 6⁷; שָׂבַעְתִּי *I am full* Is 1¹¹, &c.

Rem. To the same category probably belong also the perfects after עָרַמְתִּי *h* Ex 10³ *how long hast thou already been refusing (and refusest still . . . ? which really amounts to how long wilt thou refuse?)*, ψ 80⁵, Pr 1²² (co-ordinate with the imperf.), and after עָרַאֲנָה Ex 16²⁸, Hb 1².

(b) In direct narration to express actions which, although really *i* only in process of accomplishment, are nevertheless meant to be repre-

¹ With regard to the great but very natural preponderance of intransitive verbs (expressing an existing state), cf. the lists in Knudtson (see above, p. 309, note 2), pp. 117 and 122 in the Danish text.

² Cf. *novi, odi, memini*; *οἶδα, μέμνημαι, εἶκοι, δέδορκα, κέκραγα*; in the New Testament, *ἤλπικα, ἠγάπηκα*.

sented as already accomplished in the conception of the speaker, e. g. הִרְמֹתִי *I lift up* (my hand in ratifying an oath) Gn 14²²; נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי *I swear* Jer 22⁵; הִעֲדֵתִי *I testify* Dt 8¹⁹; יִעֲצָתִי *I counsel* 2 S 17¹¹ (but in a different context in ver. 15, *I have counselled*); אָמַרְתִּי (prop. *I say*) *I decide* (*I consider as hereby settled*) 2 S 19³⁰; *I declare* Jb 9²², 32¹⁰.

k (c) To express facts which have formerly taken place, and are still of constant recurrence, and hence are matters of common experience (the Greek *gnomic aorist*), e. g. ψ 9¹¹ *for thou, Lord, hast not forsaken* (לֹא עָזַבְתָּ) *them that seek thee*. Cf. ver. 13, also ψ 10³, 119⁴⁰ and Gn 49¹¹ (כָּבִים).

l Rem. In almost all the cases discussed in No. 2 (included under the English present) the imperfect can be used instead of the perfect, wherever the action or state in question is regarded, not as already completed, but as still continuing or just taking place (see § 107 a). Thus, לֹא יָכֹלְתִי *I am not able* ψ 40¹³ and לֹא אֵיכָל Gn 31³⁵ have practically the same meaning. Hence also it very frequently happens that the imperfect corresponds to such perfects in poetic or prophetic parallelism, e. g. Is 5¹², ψ 21¹, Pr 1²², Jb 3¹⁷.

m 3. To express *future* actions, when the speaker intends by an express assurance to represent them as finished, or as equivalent to accomplished facts:

(a) In contracts or other express stipulations (again corresponding to the English present, and therefore closely related to the instances noted under i), e. g. Gn 23¹¹ *the field I give* (נָתַתִּי) *thee*; cf. ver. 13 and 48²², 2 S 14²¹, 24²³, Jer 40⁴; in a threat, 1 S 2¹⁶, 2 S 5⁶ (unless, with Wellhausen, יִסְרֹף is to be read).—Especially in promises made by God, Gn 1²⁹, 15¹⁸, 17²⁰, Ju 1².

n (b) To express facts which are undoubtedly imminent, and, therefore, in the imagination of the speaker, already accomplished (*perfectum confidentiae*), e. g. Nu 17²⁷ הִנּוּ נֹעֲנֵנוּ אֲבָדְנוּ כָּלֵנוּ אֲבָדְנוּ *behold, we perish, we are undone, we are all undone*. Gn 30¹³, Is 6⁵ (נִדְמִיתִי *I am undone*¹), Pr 4². Even in interrogative sentences, Gn 18¹², Nu 17²⁸, 23¹⁰, Ju 9^{9,11}, Zc 4¹⁰ (?), Pr 22²⁰.² This use of the perfect occurs most frequently in prophetic language (*perfectum propheticum*). The prophet so trans-

¹ Cf. the similar use of ὄλωλα (διέφθορας, Il. 15. 128) and perii! On the kindred use of the perfect in conditional sentences, cf. below, p.

² In Gn 40¹⁴ a *perf. confidentiae* (after אִם כִּי; but cf. § 163 a) appears to be used in the expression of an earnest desire that something may happen (*but have me in thy remembrance, &c.*). Neither this passage, however, nor the use of the perfect in Arabic to express a wish or imprecation, justifies us in assuming the existence of a *precative* perfect in Hebrew. In Jb 21¹⁶, 22¹⁸, also, translate the counsel of the wicked is far from me. Cf. Driver, *Tenses*³, p. 25 f. In Is 43⁹ either נִקְבְּצִי is imperative (see § 510) or we must read יִקְבְּצִי, corresponding to יִאסְפִּי which follows.

ports himself in imagination into the future that he describes the future event as if it had been already seen or heard by him, e. g. Is 5¹⁸ *therefore my people are gone into captivity* (הָלָךְ); 9^{1 ff.}, 10²⁸, 11⁹ (after כִּי, as frequently elsewhere); 19⁷, Jb 5²⁰, 2 Ch 20³⁷. Not infrequently the imperfect interchanges with such perfects either in the parallel member or further on in the narrative.

(c) To express actions or facts, which are meant to be indicated as *o* existing in the future in a completed state (*futurum exactum*), e. g. Is 4⁴ אִם רָחַץ אֵם *when he has washed away* = *when he shall have washed away* (an *imperfect* follows in the co-ordinate sentence; cf. the conditional sentences in § 107 x); Is 6¹¹ (after אֵשׁ אֶשֶׁר עַד, as in Gn 28¹⁵, Nu 32¹⁷; also 2 S 17¹³ after אֵשׁ אֶשֶׁר עַד, Gn 24¹⁰ after עַד אֵם and elsewhere frequently after temporal conjunctions); Mi 5² (וְלָדָהּ); Gn 43¹⁴ וְאִנִּי בְּאֶשֶׁר שָׂלַחְתִּי שְׂבָלָתִי שְׂבָלָתִי *and I—if I am bereaved (orbis fuero), I am bereaved*, an expression of despairing resignation. Cf. Pr 23¹⁵, Est 4¹⁶.

4. To express actions and facts, whose accomplishment in the past *p* is to be represented, not as actual, but only as possible (generally corresponding to the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjective), e. g. Gn 31⁴² *except the God of my father . . . had been with me, surely now hadst thou sent me away empty* (שָׁלַחְתָּנִי); Gn 43¹⁰, Ex 9¹⁵ (שָׁלַחְתִּי) *I had almost put forth, &c.*; Nu 22³³, Ju 13²³, 14¹⁸, 1 S 13¹³ (הִקִּי); 2 K 13¹⁹; so frequently after בְּמַעַט *easily, almost*, Gn 26¹⁰, Is 1⁹ (where בְּמַעַט is probably to be connected with the word after it), ψ 73², 94¹⁷, 119⁸⁷, Pr 5¹⁴. Cf. also Jb 3¹⁸, 23¹⁰ (בְּחִנִּי), Ru 1¹² (*if I should think, &c.*; cf. 2 K 7⁴); in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, 1 S 25³⁴.—So also to express an unfulfilled desire, Nu 14² לִי מָתְנִי לִי *would that we had died . . . !* (לִי with the imperfect would mean *would that we might die!* 1 S 14³⁰). Finally, also in a question indicating astonishment, Gn 21⁷ מִי מָלַל *who would have said . . . ? quis dixerit ?* ψ 73¹¹.

§ 107. *Use of the Imperfect.*¹

The imperfect, as opposed to the perfect, represents actions, events, *a* or states which are regarded by the speaker at any moment as still continuing, or in process of accomplishment, or even as just taking place. In the last case, its occurrence may be represented as certainly imminent, or merely as conceived in the mind of the speaker, or simply as desired, and therefore only contingent (the modal use of the imperfect).

¹ Cf. the literature cited above, p. 309, note 2.

Knudtson (see above, Rem. on § 106 a), comparing the Ass.-Bab. usage, would prefer the term *present* rather than *imperfect*, on the ground that the tense expresses what is either actually or mentally present. In any case, the essential difference between the perfect and imperfect consists, he argues, in this, that the perfect simply indicates what is actually complete, while the imperfect places the action, &c., in a more direct relation to the judgement or feeling of the speaker.

More precisely the imperfect serves—

1. In the sphere of *past time*:

- b (a) To express actions, &c., which *continued* throughout a longer or shorter period,¹ e.g. Gn 2⁶ *a mist went up continually* (יַעֲלֶה), 2²⁵, 3⁷, 48¹⁰, Ex 1¹², 8²⁰, 13²², 15^{6.12.14.15}, Nu 9^{15 f. 20 f.}, 23⁷, Ju 2¹, 5⁸, 1 S 3², 13^{17 f.}, 2 S 2²⁸, 23¹⁰, 1 K 3⁴, 7⁸, 21⁶, Is 1²¹, 6⁴ (יִפְּלֵא), 17^{10 f.}, 51^{2 a}, Jer 13⁷, 36¹³, ψ 18^{7.14.17 ff. 38 ff.}, 24², 32^{4.5} (אֲדִירֶעֶד), 47⁵, 68^{10.12}, 104^{6 ff.}, 106¹⁹, 107^{18.29}, 139¹³, Jb 3¹¹, 4^{12.15 f.}, 10^{10 f.}, 15^{7 f.}—very frequently alternating with a perfect (especially with a frequentative perfect; cf. Nu 9¹⁵⁻²³ and § 112 e), or when the narration is continued by means of an imperfect consecutive.²

- c Rem. 1. The imperfect is frequently used in this way after the particles אֵין *then*, כֹּחֵם *not yet*, בְּתָרֵם *before*, עַד *until*, e.g. Ex 15¹ אֵין יִשְׂרָאֵל מִשָּׁה *then sang Moses*, &c.; Nu 21¹⁷, Dt 4⁴¹, Jos 10¹², 1 K 3¹⁶, 8¹, ψ 126², Jb 38²¹. (The perfect is used after אֵין when stress is to be laid on the fact that the action has really taken place, and not upon its gradual accomplishment or duration in the past, e.g. Gn 4²⁶ אֵין הִנְחֵל *then began*, &c.; Gn 49⁴, Ex 15¹⁵, Jos 22³¹, Ju 5¹¹, ψ 89²⁰).³ After כֹּחֵם e.g. Gn 19⁴ כֹּחֵם יִשְׁכְּבוּ *before they lay down*; Gn 2⁵, 24⁴⁵, 1 S 3^{3.7}, always in the sense of our *pluperfect*. (In Gn 24¹⁵ instead of the perf. בָּלָה, the imperf. should be read, as in verse 45; so also in 1 S 3⁷ [יִנְלָה] an imperf. is co-ordinated with יָדַע). After בְּתָרֵם (sometimes also simply כֹּחֵם Ex 12³⁴, Jos 3¹), e.g. Jer 1⁵ בְּתָרֵם תֵּצֵא *before thou camest forth*; Gn 27³³, 37¹⁸, 41⁵⁰, Ru 3¹⁴ (perhaps also in ψ 90² an imperf. was intended instead of יִלְדוּ; cf. Wellhausen on 2 S 3²; but note also Pr 8²⁵, in a similar context, *before the mountains were settled*, הִטְבְּעוּ, the predicate being separated from בְּתָרֵם by הָרִים, as in ψ 90²). After עַד Jos 10¹³, ψ 73¹⁷ (*until I went*), 2 Ch 29³⁴; on the other

¹ Cf. the Meša' inscription, l. 5, יֵאנֶה כְּמֹשׁ בְּאַרְצָה *for Chemosh was angry with his land*. As Driver, *Tenses*, 3rd ed., § 27, 1 a, remarks, this vivid realization of the accomplishment of the action is especially frequent in poetic and prophetic style.

² According to the Masora such imperfects occur in Is 10¹³ *bis* (where, however, יֵאֲסִיר might also mean *I am wont to remove*, &c.), Is 48³, 57¹⁷, ψ 183^{8 b}, also (according to § 49 c) in 2 S 1¹⁰ and Ez 16¹⁰. In some other cases י is no doubt a dogmatic emendation for י (imperf. consec.) in order to represent historical statements as promises; cf. Is 42⁶, 43²⁸ [contrasted with 42²⁵], 51² *bis*, 63^{3 ff.} and the note on § 53 p.

³ After אֵין *then* (to announce future events) the imperf. is naturally used in the sense of a future, Gn 24⁴¹, Ex 12⁴⁸, Mi 3⁴, Zp 3³, ψ 51²¹.

hand, with the perf., e.g. Jos 2²². As after אָן, so also after בָּטָרָם, טָרָם, and עָר the imperf. may be used, according to the context, in the sense of our future, e.g. 2 K 2⁹, Is 65²⁴, Jb 10²¹; after עָר e.g. Is 22¹⁴. The imperf. is used in the sense of our present after טָרָם in Ex 9³⁰, 10⁷.

2. Driver (*Tenses*³, p. 35 f.) rightly lays stress upon the inherent distinction *d* between the participle as expressing mere duration, and the imperfect as expressing progressive duration (in the present, past, or future). Thus the words וְנָהָר וְנָהָר Gn 2¹⁰ represent the river of Paradise as going out of Eden in a continuous, uninterrupted stream, but וַיִּפָּרַד, which immediately follows, describes how the parting of its waters is always taking place afresh. In the same way וַיַּעֲלֶה Gn 2⁶ represents new mists as constantly arising, and וַיִּמְלֵא Is 6⁴ new clouds of smoke. Also those actions, &c., which might be regarded in themselves as single or even momentary, are, as it were, broken up by the imperfect into their component parts, and so pictured as gradually completing themselves. Hence וַתִּבְלַעְמוּ Ex 15¹² (after a perf. as in verse 14) represents the Egyptians, in a vivid, poetic description, as being swallowed up one after another, and וַיִּנְחֲנִי Nu 23⁷ the leading on by stages, &c.

(b) To express actions, &c., which were repeated in the past, either *e* at fixed intervals or occasionally (the *modus rei repetitae*), e.g. Jb 1⁵ thus did (וַעֲשֶׂה) Job continually (after each occasion of his sons' festivities); 4^{3f.}, 22^{6f.}, 23¹¹, 29^{7,9,12f.}, Gn 6⁴, 29², 30⁸, 42^{31,39} (I used to bear the loss of it), Ex 1¹², 19¹⁹, 33^{7f.} (יָקַח used to take every time), 40^{36f.}, Nu 9^{17f.,20f.}, 11^{5,9}, Ju 6⁴, 14¹⁰, 21²³, 1 S 1⁷, 2²², 9⁹, 13¹⁹, 18⁵, 27⁹, 2 S 1²², 12³, 13¹⁸, 1 K 5²⁵ (of tribute repeated year by year), 10⁵, 13³³, 14²⁸, 2 K 4⁸, 8²⁹, 13²⁰, 25¹⁴, Jer 36²³, ψ 42⁵, 44³, 78^{15,40}, 103⁷, Est 2¹⁴; even in a negative dependent clause, 1 K 18¹⁰.

2. In the sphere of present time, again

(a) To express actions, events, or states, which are continued for a shorter or longer time,¹ e.g. Gn 37¹⁵ מַה-תִּבְקֹשׁ what seekest thou? 19¹⁹ לֹא-אֵיכֵל I cannot; 24⁵⁰, 31²⁵, Is 1¹³. Other examples are Gn 2¹⁰, 24³¹, 1 S 1⁸, 11⁵, 1 K 3⁷, ψ 2², and in the prophetic formula יְהוָה אָמַר saith the Lord, Is 1^{11,18}, &c., cf. 40¹. So especially to express facts known by experience, which occur at all times, and consequently hold good at any moment, e.g. Pr 15²⁰ a wise son maketh a glad father; hence especially frequent in Job and Proverbs. In an interrogative sentence, e.g. Jb 4¹⁷ is mortal man just before God? In a negative sentence, Jb 4¹⁸, &c.

(b) To express actions, &c., which may be repeated at any time, *g* including therefore the present, or are customarily repeated on a given occasion (cf. above, e), e.g. Dt 1⁴⁴ as bees do (are accustomed to

¹ It is not always possible to carry out with certainty the distinction between continued and repeated actions. Some of the examples given under *f* might equally be referred to *g*.

do); Gn 6²¹, 32³³, 43³², Jn 11⁴⁰, 1 S 2⁸, 5⁵, 20², 2 S 15³², Is 1²³, 3¹⁶, ψ 1³. So again (see f) especially to express facts known by experience which may at any time come into effect again, e.g. Ex 23⁸ *a gift blindeth* (עִוֵּר), &c.; Gn 2²⁴, 22¹⁴, Is 32⁶, Am 3⁷, Mal 1⁶, Jb 2⁴, &c. Of the same kind also is the imperfect in such relative clauses (see § 155), as Gn 49²⁷ *Benjamin is* יִטְרֶה וְיֹאכֵד *a wolf that ravineth* (properly, is accustomed to ravin). Finally, compare also the formulae יֵאָמֵר *it is* (wont to be) *said* (to introduce proverbial expressions) Gn 10⁹, 22¹⁴, &c.; לֹא-יַעֲשֶׂה בָּן *it is not* (wont to be) *so done* (and hence *may not, shall not be*, see u), Gn 29²⁶, 20⁹, 34⁷, 2 S 13¹².

h (c) To express actions, &c., which although, strictly speaking, they are already finished, are regarded as still lasting on into the present time, or continuing to operate in it, e.g. Gn 32³⁰ *wherefore is it that thou dost ask* (תִּשְׁאַל) *after my name?* 24³¹, 44⁷, Ex 5¹⁵, 2 S 16⁹. In such cases, naturally, the perfect is also admissible, and is sometimes found in the same formula as the imperfect, e.g. Jb 1⁷ (2²) מֵאַיִן תָּבֹא *whence comest thou* (just now)? but Gn 16⁸ (cf. 42⁷) אֶי-מֶהָ בָּאת *whence camest thou?* The imperfect represents the coming as still in its last stage, whereas the perfect represents it as an accomplished fact.

i 3. In the sphere of *future time*. To express actions, &c., which are to be represented as about to take place, and as continuing a shorter or longer time in the future, or as being repeated; thus:

(a) From the standpoint of the speaker's present time, e.g. Ex 4¹ *they will not believe* (יֹאמְיִנוּ) *me, nor hearken* (יִשְׁמְעוּ) *unto my voice: for they will say* (יֹאמְרוּ), &c., 6¹, 9⁵, &c.

k (b) In dependent clauses to represent actions, &c., which from some point of time in the past are to be represented as future, e.g. Gn 43⁷ *could we in any wise know that he would say* (יֹאמֵר)? 2¹⁹, 43²⁵, Ex 2⁴, 2 K 3²⁷ אֲשֶׁר-יִמְלֹךְ *qui regnaturus erat*; 13¹⁴, Jon 4⁵, Jb 3³, Ec 2³, ψ 78⁶ *that the generation to come might know*, יִלְדוּ בָנִים *the children which should be born* (*qui nascituri essent*; the imperfect here with the collateral idea of the occurrence being repeated in the future).

l (c) To represent a *futurum exactum*; cf. Is 4⁴, 6¹¹ (co-ordinated with a perfect used in the same sense, see § 106 o); so also sometimes after the temporal particles עַד, ψ 132⁵, and אֲשֶׁר עַד *until*, Gn 29⁸, Nu 20¹⁷, &c.

m 4. Finally to the sphere of future time belong also those cases in which the (modal) imperfect serves to express actions, events, or states, the occurrence of which is to be represented as willed (or not

willed), or as in some way conditional, and consequently only contingent. More particularly such imperfects serve—

(a) As an expression of will, whether it be a definite intention and *n* arrangement, or a simple desire, viz.:

(1) Sometimes in positive sentences in place of the cohortative (cf. e. g. ψ 59¹⁷ with verse 18; 2 S 22⁵⁰ with ψ 18⁵⁰; Ju 19¹¹, &c.), of the imperative (Is 18³), or of the jussive (which, however, in most cases, does not differ from the ordinary form of the imperfect), e. g. תֵּרָאֵה *let it appear* Gn 1⁹, 41³⁴, Lv 19²³, 2 S 10¹² (and so frequently in verbs ל"ה ; cf. § 109 a, note 2); Zc 9⁵ (תִּחִיל); ψ 61⁷ (תּוֹסִיף); Pr 22¹⁷ (תִּשִּׁית); 23¹, Jb 6²³ (co-ordinated with the imperative), 10²⁰ *Keth.*; so probably also יִרְיִי *let him judge!* ψ 72².—So also in the 1st pers., to express a wish which is asserted subsequently with reference to a fixed point of time in the past, e. g. Jb 10¹⁸ אֶנֶּנִּי *I ought to* [not *should* as A.V., R.V.] *have*, (then, immediately after being born) *given up the ghost*; cf. verse 19 אֶהְיֶה and אֶנְבֵּל Lv 10¹⁸, Nu 35²⁸. Even to express an obligation or necessity according to the judgement of another person, e. g. Jb 9²⁹ אֶרְשָׁע *I am to be guilty*, 12⁴. Cp. Jb 9¹⁵, 19¹⁶; in a question, ψ 42¹⁰, 43².

(2) To express the definite expectation that something will not happen. The imperfect with לֹא represents a more emphatic form of prohibition than the jussive¹ with אַל (cf. § 109 c), and corresponds to our *thou shalt not do it!* with the strongest expectation of obedience, while אַל with the jussive is rather a simple warning, *do not that!* Thus לֹא with the imperfect is especially used in enforcing the divine commands, e. g. לֹא תִגְנוֹב *thou shalt not steal* Ex 20¹⁵; cf. verses 3, 4, 5, 7, 10 ff. So לֹא with the 3rd pers. perhaps in Pr 16¹⁰.

Rem. The jussive, which is to be expected after אַל , does not, as a rule *p* (according to *n*, and § 109 a, note 2), differ in form from the simple imperfect. That many supposed jussives are intended as simple imperfects is possible from the occurrence after אַל of what are undoubtedly imperfect forms, not only from verbs ל"ה (cf. § 109 a, note 2), but also from verbs ע"ו , to express a prohibition or negative wish, אַל-תִּבְטֵחַ Gn 19¹⁷, אַל-תִּסְדֹּר Jos 1⁷, אַל-יָנֹא יָשִׁים 1 S 25²⁵. Even with the 1st pers. plur. (after an imperative) וְאַל-נָמוּת *that we die not*, 1 S 12¹⁹. Also to express the conviction that something cannot happen, אַל-יָנוּם *he will not slumber*,² ψ 121³; cf. Jer 46⁶, 2 Ch 14¹⁰.

¹ As stated in § 46 a, a prohibition cannot be expressed by אַל and the imperative.

² To regard this as an optative (so Hupfeld) is from the context impossible. It is more probably a strong pregnant construction, or fusion of two sentences (such as, *do not think he will slumber!*). Verse 4 contains the objective confirmation, by means of לֹא with the imperf., of that which was previously only a subjective conviction.

- q (3) In dependent clauses after final conjunctions (§ 165 b), as אֲשֶׁר Gn 11⁷ (לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ) *that they may not understand*; Gn 21³⁰, 27^{4,19}, Ex 9¹⁴, &c.; לִמְעַן אֲשֶׁר Nu 17⁵; לִמְעַן Dt 4¹, ψ 51⁶, 78⁶, and יַעַן אֲשֶׁר¹ Ez 12¹², *in order that*²; לְבָלְתִּי *that . . . not*, Ex 20²⁰, 2 S 14¹⁴; also after פֶּן *that not, lest*, Gn 3²², 11⁴, 19¹⁵, &c.³; cf. also the instances introduced by וְלֹא in § 109 g.—In Lv 9⁶ such an imperfect (or jussive? see the examples in § 109 f) is added to the expression of the command by an asyndeton, and in La 1¹⁹ to the principal clause simply by וְ: *while they sought them food וַיִּשְׁיבוּ אֶת־נַפְשָׁם to refresh their souls* (cf. also La 3²⁶, *it is good and let him hope*, i. e. *that he should hope*); so after an interrogative clause, Ex 2⁷. Finally also in a relative clause, ψ 32⁸ בְּדֶרֶךְ־וַי תֵּלֵךְ *in the way which thou shouldst go*.
- r (b) To express actions, &c., which are to be represented as possibly taking place or not taking place (sometimes corresponding to the *potential* of the classical languages, as also to our periphrases with *can, may, should*⁴). More particularly such imperfects are used—
- s (1) In a permissive sense, e. g. Gn 2¹⁶ *of every tree of the garden (אָכַל תֹּאכֵל) thou mayest freely eat* (the opposite in verse 17); 3², 42³⁷, Lv 21^{3,22}, Jb 21³. In the 1st pers. ψ 5⁸, 22¹⁸ (*I may, or can, tell*); in a negative sentence, e. g. ψ 5⁵.
- t (2) In interrogative sentences, e. g. Pr 20⁹ מִי־יֹאמַר *quis dixerit?* Cf. Gn 17¹⁷, 18¹⁴, 31⁴³, 1 S 11¹², 2 K 5¹² הֲלֹא־אֶרְחֹץ בָּהֶם *may I not wash in them?* Is 33¹⁴, ψ 15¹, 24⁸, Ec 5⁵. So especially in a question expressing surprise after אֵיךְ, e. g. Gn 39⁹ *how then can I . . .?* 44³⁴, Is 19¹¹, ψ 137⁴, and even with regard to some point of time in the past, looking forward from which an event might have been expected to take place, e. g. Gn 43⁷ הֲיָדוּעַ נֵדַע *could we in any wise know . . .?* Cf. 2 S 3³³ (יָמוּת) *was Abner to die as a fool*, i. e. *was he destined to die . . .?*, and so probably also Gn 34³¹ (*should he deal . . .?*). Very closely connected with this is the use of the imperfect—
- u (3) In a consecutive clause depending on an interrogative clause, e. g. Ex 3¹¹, *who am I (בִּי אֵלֶּה) that I should (ought, could) go?* 16⁷, Nu 11¹², Ju 9²³, 1 S 18¹⁸, 2 K 8¹³, Is 29¹⁶, Jb 6¹¹, 21¹⁵, similarly after אֲשֶׁר Gn 38¹⁸, Ex 5².

¹ But אֲשֶׁר יַעַן in a causal sense (*because, since*), e. g. Ju 2²⁰ (as אֲשֶׁר Gn 34²⁷) is followed by the perfect. On Jos 4²⁴ see above, § 74 g.

² R.V. *because he shall not see.*

³ In 2 K 2¹⁶ פֶּן occurs with the perf. in a vivid presentment of the time when the fear is realized and the remedy comes too late. (In 2 S 20⁶, since a perfect consec. follows, read with Driver יִמְצָא.)

⁴ By this, of course, is not meant that these finer distinctions were consciously present to the Hebrew mind. They are rather mere expedients for making intelligible to ourselves the full significance of the Semitic imperfect.

Rem. In passages like 1 S 11⁵, ψ 8⁵, 114⁵, the context shows that the *U* imperfect corresponds rather to our present. In such sentences the perfect also is naturally used in referring to completed actions, e.g. Gn 20¹⁰, Ju 18²⁸, 2 S 7¹⁸, Is 22¹.

(4) In *negative sentences* to express actions, &c., which cannot or *w* should not happen, e.g. Gn 32¹³ לֹא־יִסְפָּר מִרְבּוֹ *which cannot be numbered for multitude*; 20⁹ *deeds* (לֹא־יַעֲשֶׂי) *that ought not to be done* (cf. above, g); ψ 5⁵.

(5) In *conditional clauses* (the *modus conditionalis* corresponding *x* to the Latin present or imperfect conjunctive) both in the protasis and apodosis, or only in the latter, ψ 23⁴ רָע לֹא־אֵינִי . . . יִסְרִי־אֵלַי *yea, though I walk (or had to walk) . . . I fear (or I would fear) no evil*; Jb 9²⁰ *though I be righteous, mine own mouth shall condemn me*. After a perfect in the protasis, e.g. Jb 23¹⁰. Very frequently also in an apodosis, the protasis to which must be supplied from the context, e.g. Jb 5⁸ *but as for me, I would seek unto God (were I in thy place)*; 3^{13,16}, 14^{14f}, ψ 55¹³, Ru 1¹². However, some of the imperfects in these examples are probably intended as jussive forms. Cf. § 109 *h*.

§ 108. *Use of the Cohortative.*

The cohortative, i.e. according to § 48 *c*, the 1st pers.¹ sing. or *a* plur. of the imperfect lengthened by the ending הַ־, represents in general an endeavour directed expressly towards a definite object. While the corresponding forms of the indicative rather express the mere announcement that an action will be undertaken, the cohortative lays stress on the determination underlying the action, and the personal interest in it.

Its uses may be divided into—

1. The cohortative standing alone, or co-ordinated with another *b* cohortative, and frequently strengthened by the addition of the particle נָּ:

(a) To express self-encouragement, e.g. Ex 3³ אֶסְבֶּה־נָּא וְגִ' *I will turn aside now, and see . . . !* So especially as the result of inward deliberation (in soliloquies), e.g. Gn 18²¹, 32²¹ (rarely so used after לֹא־, Gn 21¹⁶ *let me not look . . . !* Jer 18¹⁸), and also as a more or less emphatic statement of a fixed determination, e.g. Is 5¹ *I will sing*³ . . . ! 5⁶, 31⁸. Cf. also Gn 46³⁰ *now let me die (I am willing to die)*,

¹ For the few examples of cohortatives in the 3rd sing., see § 48 *d*.

² But verbs הַ־, according to § 75 *l*, even in the cohortative, almost always have the ending הַ־; cf. e.g. in Dt 32²⁰ אֶרְאֶה אַחֲרָיָה after אֶתְחַיֶּה.

[³ R. V. *let me sing*.]

since *I have seen thy face*; and ψ 31⁸. In the 1st pers. plur. the cohortative includes a summons to others to help in doing something, e. g. ψ 2³ נִתְּקָה *come! let us break asunder!* &c., and Gn 11³.

c (b) To express a wish, or a request for permission, that one should be allowed to do something, e. g. Dt 2²⁷ אֶעְבְּרָה *may I be allowed to pass through (let me pass through)!* Nu 20¹⁷ נִעְבְּרָה־נָּא *may we be allowed to pass through!* Jer 40¹⁵ *let me go, I pray thee!* &c.; 2 S 16⁹; so after אֵל 2 S 18¹⁴; after אֵל־אֶבְשֹׁתָה 2 S 24¹⁴, Jer 17¹⁸, ψ 25² *let me not be ashamed*; cf. ψ 31^{2,18}, 71¹; 69¹⁵. After אֵל־נָּא Jon 1¹⁴.

d 2. The cohortative in dependence on other moods, as well as in conditional sentences: (a) In dependence (with *wāw* copulative; ψ 9¹⁵ after לִמְעַן) on an imperative or jussive to express an intention or intended consequence, e. g. Gn 27⁴ *bring it to me, וְאֹכְלָה that I may eat, prop. then will I eat*; Gn 19⁵, 23⁴, 24⁵⁶, 27²⁵, 29²¹, 30^{25f}, 42³⁴, 49¹, Dt 32¹, Ho 6¹, ψ 2⁸, 39¹⁴, Jb 10²⁰ *Qerê*; Is 5¹⁹ *and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come, וְנִדְעָה that we may know (it)!* Gn 26²³, 1 S 27⁵. Also after negative sentences, Gn 18^{30,32}, Ju 6³⁹, and after interrogative sentences, 1 K 22⁷, Is 40²⁵, 41²⁶, Am 8⁵.

e (b) In conditional sentences (with or without אִם) to express a contingent intention, e. g. Jb 16⁶ אִם־אֲדַבְּרָה *should I determine to speak, my grief is not assuaged, וְאִתְּחַלֶּה and should I forbear, what am I eased?* without אִם Jb 19¹⁸, 30²⁶ (where, however, וְאִתְּחַלֶּה is probably intended); ψ 73¹⁶ (unless וְאִתְּחַלֶּה should be read), 139^{8f}. After the 3rd person, Jb 11¹⁷ *though it be dark, &c.* So perhaps also 2 S 22³⁸ אֲרִדְרֶפָה *if I determined to pursue, then . . .*, but cf. ψ 18³⁸.

f (c) Likewise in the apodosis of conditional sentences, e. g. Jb 31^{7f} *if my step hath turned out of the way . . . , וְאִתְּחַלֶּה then let me sow*; cf. 16^{4f}. *I also could speak as ye do, if . . . !* So even when the condition must be supplied from the context, e. g. ψ 40⁶ *else would I declare and speak of them*; 51¹⁸ *else would I (gladly) give it*, i. e. if thou didst require it (cf. the precisely similar וְאִתְּחַלֶּה ψ 55¹³); Jb 6¹⁰. In the 1st plur. Jer 20¹⁰. To the same category belong the cohortatives after the formula expressing a wish $\text{מִי־יִתֶּנִּי, מִי־יִהְיֶה}$, e. g. Jer 9¹ *oh, that I had . . . , וְאִתְּחַלֶּה then* (i. e. if I had) *should I (or would I) leave my people, &c.*; Ju 9²⁹; without *Wāw* Is 27⁴, ψ 55⁷, Jb 23⁴ (cf. also verse 7).

g Rem. 1. The question, whether a resolution formed under compulsion (a necessity) is also expressed by the cohortative (so, according to the prevailing opinion, in Is 38¹⁰ וְאִתְּחַלֶּה ; Jer 3²⁵, 4^{19,21}, 6¹⁰, ψ 55^{3,18} (?); 57⁵, where, however, with Hupfeld, וְשָׁכַחָה should be read; 77⁷, 88¹⁶, and in the 1st plur. Is 59¹⁰), is to be answered in the sense that in these examples the cohortative form is used after its meaning has become entirely lost, merely for the sake of its fuller sound, instead of the ordinary imperfect. This view is strongly

supported by the rather numerous examples of cohortative forms after *wāw* consec. of the imperfect (cf. § 49 e, as also ψ 66⁶ נִשְׂמְחָה שָׁם there did we rejoice¹; ψ 119¹⁶³ וְאַתְּעִבָהּ; Pr 7⁷), which can likewise only be explained as forms chosen merely for euphony, and therefore due to considerations of rhythm.

2. The cohortative is strange after עַד ψ 73¹⁷ until I went . . . אֲבִינָה I considered their latter end; possibly a pregnant construction for 'until I made up my mind, saying, I will consider', &c. (but אֲבִינָה Pr 7⁷ is still dependent on the preceding וְ); עַד-אֲרָגֶנָּה Pr 12¹⁹ is at any rate to be explained in the same way (in Jer 49¹⁹, 50⁴⁴ we have כִּי-אֲרָגֶנָּה with a similar meaning), as long as I (intentionally) wink with the eyelashes (shall wink). On the other hand, in Ex 32³⁰ אֲכַפֵּר is to be read, with the Samaritan, instead of אֲכַפְּרָה after אוֹלִי.

§ 109. Use of the Jussive.

As the cohortative is used in the 1st pers., so the jussive is especially *a* found in the 2nd and 3rd pers. sing. and plur. to express a more or less definite desire that something should or should not happen (cf. for its form, which frequently coincides with that of the ordinary imperfect,² § 48 f, g). More particularly its uses may be distinguished as follows:

1. The jussive standing alone, or co-ordinated with another jussive:

(a) In affirmative sentences to express a command, a wish (or a *b* blessing), advice, or a request; in the last case (the optative or precative) it is frequently strengthened by the addition of נָא. Examples: Gn 1³ יְהִי אֹרֶךְ let there be light! Gn 1^{6,9,11}, &c. (the creative commands); Nu 6²⁶ the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace! cf. verse 25. After particles expressing a wish, Gn 30³⁴ לִי יְהִי I would it might be; ψ 81⁹ אִם-תִּשְׁמַעֲלִי if thou wouldst hearken unto me! As a humble request, Gn 44³³ . . . וְהַנֶּעַר יַעֲלֶה . . . יִשְׁכְּבָנָא עִבְדְּךָ let thy servant, I pray thee, abide, &c., and let the lad go up, &c., Gn 47⁴.

(b) In negative sentences to express prohibition or dissuasion, *c* warning, a negative wish (or imprecation), and a request. The prohibitive particle used before the jussive (according to § 107 o) is almost always אַל (in negative desires and requests frequently

¹ Analogous to this cohortative (as equivalent to the imperfect) after שָׁם is the use of the historic imperf. after אֵן, § 107 c.

² With regard to verbs לָהֵךְ, it is true that the full form of the imperfect is frequently used with the meaning of the jussive (as also for the cohortative, see § 108 a, note 2), e.g. אֲלִי-יִרְאֶה Jb 3⁹ (but previously יִבֵּן let it look for!): especially in (Neh 2³) and immediately before the principal pause, Gn 1⁹ הִרְאֶה; Ju 6³⁹ יְהִי, but previously יְהִי-נָא; Is 47³ תִּרְאֶה, previously תִּגָּל; ψ 109⁷. On the attempt to distinguish such jussives from the imperfect by means of a special meaning הִנֵּה, see § 75 hh.

אֵלֶּיךָ); e. g. Ex 34³ אֵישׁ אֶל־יִרְאָה neither let any man be seen! Pr 3⁷ be not (אֶל־תִּהְיֶה) wise in thine own eyes! Jb 15³¹ אֶל־יֵאֱמָן ne confidat. In the form of a request (prayer), Dt 9²⁶ אֶל־תִּשְׁחַת destroy not! 1 K 2²⁰, ψ 27⁹, 69¹⁸.

d Rem. 1. The few examples of אֵל with the jussive could at most have arisen from the attempt to moderate subsequently by means of the jussive (voluntative) form what was at first intended to be a strict command (אֵל with imperf. indic.); probably, however, they are either cases in which the defective writing has been misunderstood (as in 1 K 2⁶, Ez 48¹⁴), or (as in Gn 24⁸) instances of the purely rhythmical jussive form treated below, under k. Moreover, cf. יִקַּח לָא Jo 2² and from the same verb Gn 4¹² (unless it is to be referred to ה) and Dt 13¹. The same form, however, appears also to stand three times for the cohortative (see below), and in Nu 22¹⁹ for the ordinary imperfect (but see below, i). Thus it is doubtful whether an imaginary by-form of the ordinary imperf. is not intended by the Masora in all these cases, and whether consequently יִקַּח, &c., should not be restored.—On לֹא־תַחֲסֹם עֵינֶיךָ, &c., Dt 7¹⁶, 13⁹, &c., Ez 5¹¹, &c., cf. § 72 r, according to which תַּחֲסֹם should probably be read in every case.—The jussive appears in the place of the cohortative after לָא 1 S 14³⁶ (וְלֹא־נִשְׁאָר) co-ordinated with two cohortatives), 2 S 17¹²; cf. Is 41²³ Keth. (וְנִרְאָה, i. e. וְנִרְאָה, after another cohortative); also (see above) לָא אֶקַּח Dt 18¹⁶, Ho 9¹⁵, and even without לָא Ez 5¹⁶.

e 2. אֵל־ with the jussive (or imperf., cf. § 107 p) is used sometimes to express the conviction that something cannot or should not happen; cf. Is 2⁹ (where, however, the text is very doubtful) וְאֶל־תִּשָּׂא לָהֶם and thou canst not possibly forgive them [R.V. therefore forgive them not]; ψ 34⁶, 41³, 50³, 121³ (אֶל־יִתֵּן); Pr 3²⁵, Jb 5²² אֶל־תִּירָא neither needest thou be afraid; 20¹⁷, 40³².

f 2. The jussive depending on other moods, or in conditional sentences:

(a) Depending¹ (with Wāw) on an imperative or cohortative to express an intention or an assurance of a contingent occurrence, e. g. Gn 24⁵¹ take her and go, and let her be (וְתִהְיֶה prop. and she will be) . . . ; 30³, 31³⁷, 38²⁴, Ex 8⁴, 9¹³, 10¹⁷, 14², Jos 4¹⁶, Ju 6³⁰, 1 S 5¹¹, 7³, 1 K 21¹⁰, ψ 144⁵, Pr 20²², Jb 14⁶. Also after interrogative sentences, which include a demand, Est 7² (say) what is thy desire . . . , וְתַעֲשֶׂה and it shall (i. e. in order that it may) be granted! 1 K 22²⁰, Is 19¹², Jb 38^{34f}. Depending on a cohortative, e. g. Gn 19²⁰ אֲמַלְּטָה נָא שְׂמָךְ oh, let me escape thither . . . וְתָחִי נַפְשִׁי that my soul may live; even after a simple imperf. (cf. below, g), 1 K 13³³ whosoever would, he consecrated him . . . וְיִהְיֶה that he might be a priest (read פִּהֵן) of the high places, but probably the LXX reading וְיִהְיֶה is to be preferred.

¹ This does not include the cases in which the jussive is not logically dependent on a preceding imperat., but is merely co-ordinated, e. g. Gn 20⁷, ψ 27¹⁴, &c.

Rem. In 2 Ch 35²¹ a negative final clause with וְלֹא is dependent on an *g* imperative, *forbear from* (meddling with) God . . . *that he destroy thee not*. As a rule, however, negative final clauses are attached to the principal sentence by means of וְלֹא and a following imperfect; so after an imperative, Gn 42², 1 K 14², 18⁴⁴; after a jussive, Ex 30²⁰, Neh 6⁹; after a perfect consec., Ex 28^{35,43}, 30¹², Nu 18⁵; after לֹא with an imperfect, Lv 10⁶, Nu 18³, Dt 17¹⁷ *neither shall he multiply wives unto himself* ($\text{וְלֹא יִסַּר לְבָבוֹ}$) *that his heart turn not away*; 1 S 20¹⁴, 2 S 21¹⁷, Jer 11²¹; after לֹא with jussive, Lv 10⁹, 11⁴³, 16², 2 S 13²⁵, Jer 25⁶, 37²⁰, 38^{24 f.}; after the asseverative אִם with the impft., Gn 14²³; even after a simple imperfect, Jer 10⁴ *with nails . . . they fasten it* (וְלֹא יָפִיק) *that it move not*; after a participle, Jb 9⁷.

(b) Frequently in conditional sentences (as in Arabic), either in the *h* protasis or in the apodosis, cf. ψ 45¹² יִתְאוּ *should he desire . . . then . . .*; 104²⁰ $\text{וְהָיָה . . . תְּהֵיטָה}$ *if thou makest darkness, then it is night*; so also in the protasis, Ex 22⁴, Lv 15²⁴, Is 41²⁸, Ez 14⁷ (וְיָעַל), Jb 34²⁹; in the apodosis, Ex 7⁹ *then will it (not, then shall it) become a serpent*; Pr 9⁹ after an imperat. in the protasis; Jb 10¹⁶, 13⁵, 22²⁸. In a negative apodosis, Gn 4¹² (לֹא-תִסָּעֶה , but see above, d). In 2 K 6²⁷ אֶל-יִשְׁעֶךָ (*if the Lord do not help thee, &c.*) is to be explained as a jussive in a negative protasis.

Rem. Undoubtedly this use of the jussive (in conditional sentences) is based *i* on its original *voluntative* meaning; let something be so and so, then this or that must happen as a consequence. Certain other examples of the *jussive*, however, show that in the consciousness of the language the *voluntative* has in such cases become weakened almost to a *potential* mood, and hence the *jussive* serves to express facts which may happen *contingently*, or may be expected, e.g. Nu 22¹⁹ מָה-יִסָּרְךָ , but cf. above, d); Jb 9³³ *there is no daysman betwixt us, that might lay* (יִשֵּׁת , hence plainly a *subjunctive* = *qui ponat*; also in Nu 23¹⁹ וַיִּכְנַב *that he should lie* is probably intended as a jussive); Ec 5¹⁴; so after interrogative sentences, Jer 9¹¹ *who is the wise man*, וַיֵּבֶן *qui intelligat hoc?*; Ho 14¹⁰.

Moreover, in not a few cases, the jussive is used, without any collateral *k* sense, for the ordinary imperfect form, and this occurs not alone in forms, which may arise from a misunderstanding of the defective writing, as Dt 28^{21,36}, 32⁸, 1 K 8¹, Is 12¹, Mi 3⁴, 5⁸, ψ 11⁶, 18¹³, 21² *Q^{er}ê* (מָה-יָגִיל , *K^{eth}. וְיִגִּיל*), 25⁹, 47⁴, 90³, 91⁴, 107²³, Pr 15²⁵, Jb 13²⁷, 15³³, 18⁹, 20^{23 b}, 27²², 33¹¹, 36¹⁴, 38²⁴, Ec 12⁶ (verse 7 יִשָּׁב , but immediately afterwards תִּשָּׁב), Dn 8¹²,—but also in shortened forms, such as יִהִי Gn 49¹⁷ (Sam. יִהִי , Dt 28⁸, 1 S 10⁵, 2 S 5²⁴, Ho 6¹, 11⁴, Am 5¹⁴, Mi 1², Zp 2¹³, Zc 9⁵, ψ 72^{16 f.} (after other jussives), 104³¹, Jb 18¹², 20^{23,26,28}, 27⁸, 33²¹, 34³⁷, Ru 3⁴. This use of the jussive can hardly be due merely to poetic licence, but is rather to be explained on rhythmical grounds. In all the above-cited examples, in fact, the jussive stands at the beginning of the sentence (and hence removed as far as possible from the principal tone), in others it is immediately before the principal pause (Is 42⁶, 50², ψ 68¹⁵, Pr 23²⁵, Jb 24¹⁴, 29³, 40¹⁹), or actually in pause (Dt 32¹⁸, Jb 23^{9,11}, La 3⁵⁰), and is then a simply rhythmical shortening due to the strong influence of the tone. Moreover, since the jussive in numerous cases is not distinguished in form from the imperfect (§ 48 g), it is frequently doubtful which of the two the writer intended. This especially applies to those cases, in which a *subjunctive* is to be expressed by one or other of the forms (cf. § 107 k and m-x).

§ 110. The Imperative.

Mayer Lambert, 'Sur la syntaxe de l'impératif en hébreu,' in *REJ.* 1897, p. 106 ff.

- a* 1. The imperative,¹ which, according to § 46, is restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. and plur., and to *positive* commands, &c., may stand either alone, or in simple co-ordination (as in 1 K 18⁴⁴, Is 56¹, 65¹³) with other imperatives:
- (*a*) To express real commands, e.g. Gn 12¹ *get thee out of thy country*; or (like the jussive) mere admonitions (Ho 10¹²) and requests, 2 K 5²², Is 5³; on the addition of **נִּיְ** see below, Rem. 1. The imperative is used in the sense of an ironical challenge (often including a threat) in 1 K 22²² *ask for him the kingdom also*; 22¹⁵, Ju 10¹⁴, Is 47¹² (with **נִּיְ**), Jer 7²¹, Ez 20³⁹, Am 4⁴, Jb 38³⁴, 40^{10ff.}, La 4²¹. The imperative has a concessive sense in Na 3¹⁵ (though thou *make thyself many*, &c.), and in the cases discussed under *f*, e.g. Is 8^{9f.}, 29⁹.
- b* (*b*) To express permission, e.g. 2 S 18²³ after previous dissuasion, (then) *run* (as far as I am concerned)! Is 21¹², 45¹¹.
- c* (*c*) To express a distinct assurance (like our expression, *thou shalt have it*)² or promise, e.g. Is 65¹³ *but be ye glad*, &c. (i.e. ye will have continually occasion to be glad); and Is 37³⁰, ψ 110²; in a threat, Jer 2¹⁹. So especially in commands, the fulfilment of which is altogether out of the power of the person addressed, e.g. Is 54¹⁴ *be far from anxiety* (meaning, thou needst not fear any more); Gn 1²⁸, &c. (for other examples, such as 1 K 22¹², 2 K 5¹³, see below, *f*). Most clearly in the case of the imperative *Niph'al* with a passive meaning, e.g. Gn 42¹⁶ **וְאַתֶּם הָאֲסוּרִים** *and ye shall be bound*; Dt 32⁵⁰, Is 49⁹ (Is 45²², see below, *f*).
- d* Rem. 1. The particle **נִיְ** *age!* (§ 105) is frequently added to the imperative, as to the jussive, sometimes to soften down a command, or to make a request in a more courteous form (see above, *a*), Gn 12¹³, 24², sometimes to strengthen an exhortation uttered as a rebuke or threat (Nu 16²⁶, 20¹⁰) or in ridicule (Is 47¹²).
- e* 2. The imperative after the desiderative particle **לֵךְ** Gn 23¹³ (at the end of verses 5 and 14 also read **לֵךְ** for **לֵךְ** and join it to the following imperative) is due to an anacoluthon. Instead of the imperfect which would be expected here after **לֵךְ**, the more forcible imperative is used in a new sentence.
- f* 2. The imperative in logical dependence upon a preceding imperative, jussive (or cohortative), or an interrogative sentence, serves to

¹ On the close relation between the imperative and jussive (both in meaning and form), cf. § 46 and § 48 *i*.

² Like the threatening formulae in the Latin comic writers, e.g. *vapula*, Ter. Phorm. v. 6, 10 = *vapulare te iubeo*, Plaut. Curc. vi. 4, 12.

express the distinct assurance or promise that an action or state will ensue as the certain consequence of a previous action. So especially:

(a) The imperative when depending (with *wāw copulative*) upon another imperative. In this case the first imperative contains, as a rule, a condition, while the second declares the consequence which the fulfilment of the condition will involve. The imperative is used for this declaration, since the consequence is, as a matter of fact, intended or desired by the speaker (cf. *divide et impera*), e.g. Gn 42¹⁸ וְאַתָּה עֲשֵׂה וְחַיִּי *this do, and live*, i. e. thus shall ye continue to live. Gn 17¹, 1 K 22¹², 2 K 5¹³, Is 36¹⁶, 45²² (וְהַנִּשְׁעוּ), Jer 6¹⁶, Am 5^{4,6}, ψ 37²⁷, Pr 3^{3f.}, 4⁴, 7², 13²⁰ *Keth.*, Jb 2⁹, 2 Ch 20²⁰; in Jer 25⁵, Jb 22²¹ נָא is added to the first imperative. In other cases, the first imperative contains a mocking concession, the second an irrevocable denunciation, e.g. Is 8⁹ וְהָחִי רָעוּ עַמִּים (continue to) *make an uproar, O ye peoples, and ye shall be broken in pieces*; cf. verse 9 b.

Rem. 1. If a promise or threat dependent on an imperative be expressed in the 3rd pers. then the jussive is naturally used instead of the 2nd imperative g
Is 8¹⁰, 55².

2. In Pr 20¹⁸ the second imperative (containing a promise) is attached by *h* asyndeton; elsewhere two imperatives occur side by side without the copula, where the second might be expected to be subordinated to the first, e.g. Dt 2²⁴ רֵשׁ הַחֵל (where רֵשׁ is virtually, as it were, an object to הַחֵל) *begin, take in possession for to take in possession* (cf., however, Ju 19⁶ הוֹאֵל-נָא וְלֵין *be content, I pray thee, and tarry all night*, and on this kind of co-ordination in general, cf. § 120 d). But such imperatives as לָךְ (לָבוֹ), קוּם (קוּמוּ), when immediately preceding a second imperative, are for the most part only equivalent to interjections, *come! up!*

(b) The imperative, when depending (with *wāw copulative*) upon *i* a jussive (cohortative), or an interrogative sentence, frequently expresses also a consequence which is to be expected with certainty, and often a consequence which is intended, or in fact an intention; cf. Gn 20⁷ *and he shall pray for thee*, וְחַיִּי *and thou shalt live*; cf. Ex 14¹⁶, 2 K 5¹⁰, Jb 11⁶, ψ 128⁶ *the Lord bless thee . . . so that* (or *in order that*) *thou seest*, &c.; Ru 1⁹, 4¹¹; after a cohortative, Gn 12², 45¹⁸, Ex 3¹⁰ וְהוֹצֵאתָ *that thou mayest bring forth*; Ex 18²², 1 S 12¹⁷, 1 K 1¹²; Jer 35¹⁵ (after imperative and jussive); after an interrogative sentence, 2 S 21³ *wherewith shall I make atonement*, וְיְבָרְכֵי *that ye may bless*, &c.—In Nu 5¹⁹ the imperative without ! (in 32²⁸ with !) is used after a conditional clause in the sense of a definite promise.

Rem. The 2nd sing. masc. occurs in addressing feminine persons in Ju 4²⁰ *k* (עֲמָרְךָ, according to Qimḥi an infinitive, in which case, however, the infinitive absolute עֲמָר should be read; but probably we should simply read עֲמָרְךָ with Moore), Mi 1¹³ and Zc 13⁷ (after עֲנִי); and in Is 23¹, the 2nd plur. masc. (On

the four forms of the 2nd fem. plur. imperative in Is 32¹¹, erroneously explained here in former editions, see now § 48 i). In Na 3¹⁵ the interchange of masc. and fem. serves to express totality (the nation in all its aspects). Cf., moreover, § 145 p on other noticeable attempts to substitute the corresponding masculine forms for the feminine.

§ 111. The Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive.

- a** 1. The *imperfect with wāw consecutive* (§ 49 a-g) serves to express actions, events, or states, which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequel of actions, events, or states mentioned immediately¹ before. The *imperfect consecutive* is used in this way most frequently as the *narrative tense*, corresponding to the Greek *aorist* or the Latin *historic perfect*. As a rule the narrative is introduced by a perfect, and then continued by means of imperfects with *wāw consecutive* (on this interchange of tenses cf. § 49 a, and especially § 112 a), e.g. Gn 3¹ *now the serpent was* (וַיְהִי) *more subtil . . . and he said* (וַיֹּאמֶר) *unto the woman*; 4¹, 6^{9ff.}, 10^{9f.}, 15¹⁹, 11^{12ff. 27ff.}, 14^{5f.}, 15^{1f.}, 16^{1f.}, 21^{1ff.}, 24^{1f.}, 25^{19ff.}, 36^{2ff.}, 37².
- b** Rem. 1. To this class belong some of the numerous *imperfects consec.* after various expressions of time, whenever such expressions are equivalent in meaning to a perfect² (viz. וַיְהִי *it came to pass*), e.g. Is 6¹ *in the year that king Uzziah died, I saw* (וַיֵּרָא), &c.; Gn 2⁴, 27³⁴, Ju 11¹⁶, 1 S 4¹⁹, 17⁵⁷, 21⁶, Ho 11¹; on the use of וַיְהִי to connect expressions of time, see below, g.—It is only in late books or passages that we find the simple *perfect* in a clause following an expression of time, as 1 S 17⁵⁵ (cf. Driver on the passage), 2 Ch 12⁷, 15⁸, &c., Dn 10¹¹, 15¹⁹; the *Perfect* after וַיְהִי and the subject, 2 Ch 7¹.
- c** 2. The continuation of the narrative by means of the imperfect consec. may result in a series of any number of such imperfects, e.g. there are forty-nine in Gn. 1. As soon, however, as the connecting *Wāw* becomes separated from the verb to which it belongs, by the insertion of any word, the perfect necessarily takes the place of the imperfect, e.g. Gn 1⁵ *and God called* (וַיִּקְרָא) *the light Day, and the darkness he called* (וַיִּקְרָא לַחֹשֶׁךְ) *Night*; verse 10, 2²⁰, 11³ and frequently.
- d** 3. Of two co-ordinate *imperfects consecutive* the former (as equivalent to a temporal clause) is most frequently subordinate in sense to the latter, e.g. Gn 28^{8f.} וַיֵּלֶךְ . . . וַיֵּרָא עֵשָׂו *when Esau saw that . . . , he went*, &c.; so also, frequently וַיִּשְׁמַע, &c., Gn 37²¹, &c. On the other hand, a second *imperfect consecutive* is seldom used in an explanatory sense, e.g. Ex 2¹⁰ (וַתֹּאמֶר *for she said*); cf. 1 S 7¹². Other examples of the imperfect consecutive, which apparently represent a progress in the narrative, in reality only refer to the same time, or explain what precedes, see Gn 2²⁵ (וַיִּהְיֶה *they were*; but Jos 4⁹, 1 K 8⁸ *they are*); Gn 36¹⁴ (וַתֵּלֶךְ), 36³² (וַיִּמְלֹךְ), 1 K 1⁴⁴.

¹ On an apparent exception (the *imperf. consec.* at the beginning of whole books) see § 49 b note.

² Cf. Is 45⁴, where the *imperf. consec.* is joined to an abrupt statement of the cause, and Jb 36⁷, where it is joined to an abrupt statement of the place.

4. The imperfect consecutive sometimes has such a merely *external* connexion with an immediately preceding perfect, that in reality it represents an antithesis to it, e.g. Gn 32³¹ and (yet) my life is preserved; 2 S 3⁸ and yet thou chargest me; Jb 10⁸, 32⁸; similarly in dependence on noun-clauses, Pr 30^{25 ff.}

2. The introduction of independent narratives, or of a new section *f* of the narrative, by means of an *imperfect consecutive*, likewise aims at a connexion, though again loose and external, with that which has been narrated previously. Such a connexion is especially often established by means of וַיְהִי (καὶ ἐγένετο) and it came to pass, after which there then follows either (most commonly) an *imperfect consecutive* (Gn 4^{3,8}, 8⁶, 11², Ex 12²⁹, 13¹⁷, &c.), or Wāw with the perfect (separated from it), Gn 7¹⁰, 15¹², 22¹, 27³⁰, or even a perfect without Wāw (Gn 8¹³, 14^{1f.}, 40¹, Ex 12⁴¹, 16²², Nu 10¹¹, Dt 1³, 1 S 18³⁰, 2 K 8²¹, &c.), or finally a noun-clause introduced by Wāw, Gn 41¹.

Rem. 1. This loose connexion by means of וַיְהִי¹ is especially common, *g* when the narrative or a new section of it begins with any expression of time, see above, *b*; cf., in addition to the above-mentioned examples (e.g. Gn 22¹ and it came to pass after these things, that God did prove Abraham), the similar cases in Gn 19³⁴, 21²², 1 S 11¹¹, Ru 1¹. Elsewhere the statement of time is expressed by וַ or וּ with an infinitive (Gn 12¹⁴, 19^{17,29} 39¹³, 15^{18f.}, Ju 16²⁵) or by an independent sentence with the perfect (equivalent to a pluperfect, cf. § 106 *f*), e.g. Gn 15¹⁷, 24¹⁵, 27⁸⁰, or by a temporal clause introduced by כִּי when, Gn 26⁸, 27¹, Ju 16¹⁶, כַּאֲשֶׁר when, Gn 12¹¹, 20¹³, מֵאָז from the time that, Gn 39⁵; or, finally, by a noun-clause (cf. § 116 *u*), e.g. 2 K 13²¹ הֵם קִבְּרִים אֵינֶשׁ וַיְהִי הֵם קִבְּרִים אֵינֶשׁ and it came to pass, as they were (just) burying a man (prop. they burying), that . . .; Gn 42⁸⁵, 2 K 2¹¹ (the apodosis in both these cases being introduced by וְהָיָה); 1 S 7¹⁰, 2 S 13³⁰, 2 K 6^{5,26}, 19³⁷ (= Is 37³⁸).—In 1 S 10¹¹, 11¹¹, 2 S 2²³, 15² a noun standing absolutely follows וַיְהִי (as the equivalent of a complete sentence; see below, *h*), and then an *imperfect consecutive* follows.

2. Closely related to the cases noticed in *g* are those in which the *imperfect h* consecutive, even without a preceding וַיְהִי, introduces the apodosis either—(a) to whole sentences, or (b) to what are equivalent to whole sentences, especially to nouns standing absolutely. As in certain cases of the *perfect consecutive* (see § 112 *x*), so the *imperfect consecutive* has here acquired a sort of independent force. Cf. for (a) 1 S 15²³ because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, וַיִּמְאַסְךָ he hath rejected thee (cf. Nu 14¹⁶, Is 48⁴, where the causal clause precedes in the form of an infinitive with preposition), Ex 9²¹; for (b) Gn 22²⁴ וַיִּבְלַעַנְהָ and (as to) his concubine . . . , וַתֵּלֶךְ she bare, &c.; Ex 38²⁴, Nu 14^{38f.}, 1 S 14¹⁹, 17²⁴, 2 S 4¹⁰, 19⁴¹ K^{eth.}, 21¹⁶, 1 K 9^{20f.}, 12¹⁷, 2 K 25²², Jer 6¹⁹, 28⁸, 33²⁴, 44²⁵, 2—In 1 K 15¹³, 2 K 16¹⁴ the preceding noun, used absolutely, is even regarded as the object of the following *imperfect consecutive*, and is therefore introduced by אֲתָּה.

¹ Exhaustive statistics of the use of וַיְהִי in its many and various connexions are given by König in ZAW. 1899, p. 260 ff.

² Cf. the Mēša' inscription, l. 5 (Omri) the king of Israel, וַיַּעַבְדֵם he oppressed Moab, &c.—The peculiar imperfect consecutive in Gn 30^{27b} (in the earlier editions explained as equivalent to an object-clause) arises rather from a pregnant brevity of expression: I have observed and have come to the conclusion, the Lord hath blessed me, &c.—In Gn 27³⁴ read, with LXX, וַיְהִי before בְּשִׁבְמוֹ.

- i 3. The *imperfect consecutive* serves, in the cases treated under *a-h*, to represent either expressly, or at least to a great extent, a *chronological* succession of actions or events; elsewhere it expresses those actions, &c., which represent the logical consequence of what preceded, or a result arising from it by an inherent necessity. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* is used—
- k (a) As a final summing up of the preceding narrative, e.g. Gn 2¹, 23²⁰ וַיְהִי וַיֵּקֶם הַשָּׂדֶה וַיֵּקֶם הַשָּׂדֶה וַיֵּקֶם הַשָּׂדֶה so (in this way) *the field became* (legally) *the property of Abraham*, &c.; 1 S 17⁵⁰, 31⁶.
- l (b) To express a logical or necessary consequence of that which immediately precedes, e.g. Gn 39², Jb 2³ and *he still holdeth fast his integrity*, וַיִּסְתַּחֲסֵף וַיִּסְתַּחֲסֵף וַיִּסְתַּחֲסֵף so *that thou thus* (as it now appears) *groundlessly movedst me against him*; ψ 65⁹ so *that they are afraid* . . . ; even a consequence which happens conditionally, Jer 20¹⁷ וַתְּהִי וַתְּהִי וַתְּהִי so *that my mother should have been* . . . Another instance of the kind perhaps (if the text be correct) is Jer 38⁹ וַיָּמָת וַיָּמָת וַיָּמָת so *that he dies* (must die).
- m Rem. Such consecutive clauses frequently occur after interrogative sentences, e.g. Is 51¹² *who art thou* (i.e. *art thou so helpless*), וַתִּירָא וַתִּירָא וַתִּירָא *that thou art* (must needs be) *afraid*? ψ 144³ (cf. ψ 8⁵, where in a very similar context כִּי *that* is used with the imperfect); Gn 12¹⁹ (וַאֲנִי); 31²⁷ וַאֲשֶׁר־לְחַךְ וַאֲשֶׁר־לְחַךְ so *that I might have sent thee away*.
4. As regards the range of time it is to be carefully noticed—
- n (a) That the *imperfect consecutive* may represent all varieties in the relations of tense and mood, which, according to § 107 *a*, follow from the idea of the imperfect;
- o (b) That the more precise determination of the range of time to which an *imperfect consecutive* relates must be inferred in each case from the character of the preceding tense (or tense-equivalent), to which it is attached, in a more or less close relation, as temporal or logical sequence. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* serves—
- p (1) To represent actions, events, or states, which are *past* (or were repeated in past time), when it is united with tenses, or their equivalents, which refer to an actual past.
- q Cf. the examples given above, under *a* and *f*, of the *imperfect consecutive* as an historic tense. The *imperfect consecutive* also frequently occurs as the continuation of a perfect (*preterite*) in a subordinate clause; e.g. Gn 27¹, Nu 11²⁰, Dt 4³⁷, 1 S 8⁸, 1 K 2⁵, 11³⁸, 18¹³, &c.; also in Is 49⁷ וַיְבַרְכֵּךְ וַיְבַרְכֵּךְ וַיְבַרְכֵּךְ is the continuation of a preterite, contained, according to the sense, in the preceding וַיֵּשֶׁב וַיֵּשֶׁב וַיֵּשֶׁב.—In Jb 31^{28,34} the *imperfect consecutive* is joined to an imperfect denoting the past in a conditional sentence. An *imperfect consecutive* occurs in dependence on a perfect which has the sense of a pluperfect (§ 106 *f*), e.g. in Gn 26¹⁸, 28^{6 f.}, 31^{19,34} (now Rachel had taken the teraphim, וַהֲשִׁימָם and had

put them, &c.); Nu 14³⁸, 1 S 28³, 2 S 2²³, Is 39¹. Finally there are the cases in which an infinitive or participial construction representing past time, according to § 113 r, § 116 x, is taken up and continued by an imperfect consecutive.

(2) To represent *present* actions, &c., in connexion with tenses, or *r* their equivalents, which describe actions and states as being either present or lasting on into the present (continuing in their effect); so especially,

(a) In connexion with the present perfects, described in § 106 g, e.g. ψ 16⁹ *therefore my heart is glad* (שָׂמֵחַ) *and my glory rejoiceth* (וַיִּגְלַל); Is 3¹⁶ (parallel with a simple imperfect). Cf. also such examples as ψ 29¹⁰ וַיֵּשֶׁב (prop. he sat down, and has been enthroned ever since), ψ 41¹³.

(β) In connexion with those perfects which represent experiences & frequently confirmed (see § 106 k), e.g. Jb 14² *he cometh up* (וַיֵּצֵא) *like a flower, and is cut down* (וַיִּפֹּל); *he fleeth* (וַיִּבָּרַח) *also as a shadow, and continueth not*; Jb 20¹⁵, 24^{2,11}, Is 40²⁴, Pr 11².

(γ) In connexion with imperfects which, in one of the ways *t* described in § 107. 2, are used in the sense of the present; e.g. Jb 14¹⁰ *but man dieth* (וַיָּמוּת) *and becometh powerless* (וַיִּחַלְשׁ), &c., i. e. remains powerless; Jb 4⁵, Ho 8¹³, Hb 1^{9f.}, ψ 55¹⁸, 90³, Jb 5¹⁸, 7¹⁸, 11³ (*when thou mockest*), 12²⁵, 34²⁴, 37⁸ (parallel with a simple imperfect); 39¹⁵. In the apodosis of a conditional sentence, ψ 59¹⁶, so also after an interrogative imperfect, 1 S 2²⁹, ψ 42⁶ (וַתַּהַיֵּי for which in verse 12 and in 43⁵ we have וַיִּמְהַרְתָּהּ and *why art thou disquieted?*).

(δ) In dependence on participles, which represent what at present *u* continues or is being repeated, e.g. Nu 22¹¹, 1 S 2⁶, 2 S 19² *behold the king weepeth* (בֹּכֶה) *and mourneth* (וַיִּתְאַבֵּל) *for Absalom*; Am 5⁸, 9^{5f.}, Na 1⁴, ψ 34⁸, Pr 20²⁶, Jb 12^{22ff.}, but cf. e.g. Jb 12⁴ קָרָא לְאֱלֹהֵי וַיַּעֲנֵהוּ *who called upon God, and he answered him*.

(ε) In dependence on other equivalents of the present, as in Is 51¹², ψ 144³ (see above, *m*); Jb 10²². So especially as the continuation of an infinitive, which is governed by a preposition (cf. § 114 r), Is 30¹², Jer 10¹³, ψ 92⁸, &c.

(3) To represent *future* actions, &c., in dependence on—(a) an *w* imperfect which refers to the future, ψ 49¹⁵, 94^{22f.};—(β) a perfect consecutive, or those perfects which, according to § 106 n, are intended to represent future events as undoubtedly certain, and therefore as though already accomplished (*perf. propheticum*); cf. Is 5¹⁵ (parallel with a simple imperfect separated from ו); 5¹⁶ (cf. 2^{11,17}, where the same threat is expressed by the perfect consecutive); 5²⁵, 9^{5,10f.},

13^{15, 17 ff.}, 22^{7 ff.}, Jo 2²³, Mi 2¹³, Ez 33^{4, 6}, ψ 7¹³, 64^{8 ff.};—(γ) a future participle, Jer 4¹⁵.¹

- x Rem. An imperfect consecutive in dependence on a perfect or imperfect, which represents an action occurring only conditionally, is likewise used only in a hypothetical sense, e.g. Jb 9¹⁶ אִם־קָרָאתִי וְיַעֲנֵנִי *if I had called, and he had answered me, yet . . .*; ψ 139¹¹ וְאָמַרְתִּי *if I should say* (previously, in verse 8 f., hypothetical imperfects are used).—In Is 48^{18 f.} an imperfect consecutive occurs in dependence on a sentence expressing a wish introduced by וְיָהִי (וְיָהִי *utinam* and it, or so that it were, equivalent to *then should it be*). Cf. also the examples mentioned above, under l (Jer 20¹⁷) and m (Gn 31²⁷), where the imperfect consecutive expresses facts occurring contingently.

§ 112. The Perfect with Wāw Consecutive.

G. R. Berry, 'Waw consecutive with the perfect in Hebrew,' in *Bibl. Lit.*, xxii. (1903), pp. 60-69.

- a 1. The perfect, like the imperfect (§ 111), is used with *wāw consecutive* (cf. § 49 a; on the external differentiation of the perfect consecutive by a change in the position of the tone, see § 49 h) to express actions, events, or states, which are to be attached to what precedes, in a more or less close relation, as its *temporal* or *logical* consequence. And as, according to § 111 a, the narrative which begins with a perfect, or its equivalent, is continued in the imperfect consecutive, so, vice versa, the perfect consecutive forms the regular continuation to a preceding imperfect, or its equivalent.

- b Rem. 1. This alternation of perfect and imperfect or their equivalents is a striking peculiarity of the *consecutio temporum* in Hebrew. It not only affords a certain compensation for the lack of forms for tenses and moods, but also gives to Hebrew style the charm of an expressive variety, an action conceived as being still in progress (*imperfect*, &c.), reaching afterwards in the *perfect* a calm and settled conclusion, in order to be again exhibited in movement in the imperfect, and vice versa.² The strict regularity of this

¹ Also in Jer 51²⁹ the imperfects consecutive are attached to the threat virtually contained in the preceding imperatives. On the other hand וְיָהִי־לִי Ho 8¹⁰ would be very remarkable as expressing a future; the text is, however, certainly corrupt, and hence the Cod. Babyl. and the Erfurt MS. 3 endeavour to remedy it by וְיָהִי, and Ewald reads וְיָהִי־לִי.—In Ez 28¹⁶ (cf. Jer 15^{6 f.}) וְיָהִי־לִי appears to announce an action irrevocably determined upon, and therefore represented as already accomplished; cf. the prophetic perfects in verse 17 ff.

² It is difficult to give a proper explanation of this phenomenon (according to § 49 a, note, to be found only in the Canaanitish group of languages), when we have given up the theory of a special *wāw conversivum* in the unscientific sense mentioned in § 49 b, note, at the end, and if we accept the fact that the *perfect* and *imperfect consecutive* cannot possibly be used in a way which contradicts their fundamental character as described in §§ 106 and 107. In other words, even the *perfect consecutive* originally represents a finally completed action, &c., just as the *imperfect consecutive* represents an action which

alternation belongs indeed rather to the higher style, and even then it depends upon the view and intention of the speaker, whether he wishes the action, &c., to be regarded as the logical consequence of what has preceded, or as simply co-ordinate with it, and so in the same tense.

2. A succession of any number of other *perfects consecutive* may be co-ordinated with a *perfect consecutive* (cf. e. g. Ez 14¹³, Am 5¹⁹, Ru 3³, four perfects in each case, Is 8⁷ five, Ex 6^{6f.} eight). It is true, however, of the perfect (as conversely of the *imperfect*, § 111 c), that as soon as the *Wāw* is separated by any intervening word from the verb to which it belongs, an *imperfect* necessarily takes the place of the *perfect*, e. g. Gn 12¹² *when the Egyptians shall see thee, they shall say* (וַיֹּאמְרוּ), *This is his wife: and they will kill me* (וַיִּהְיוּ אֹתִי) *but thee they will save alive* (וַיִּחְיֶיךָ).

2. The perfect consecutive, like the imperfect consecutive, always *d* belongs to the period of time expressed by the preceding tense, or its equivalent, with which it is connected as the temporal or logical consequence. The particular cases may be classed under three heads: (a) the perfect consecutive in *immediate* dependence (see *e*), (b) in loose connexion (see *x*) with the preceding, and (c) the perfect consecutive at the beginning of the apodosis to other sentences, or their equivalents (see *ff*).

3. The perfect consecutive in immediate dependence on the preceding tense, or its equivalent, serves

(a) As a frequentative tense to express *past* actions, &c., i. e. actions repeatedly brought to a conclusion in the past, and follows tenses, or their equivalents, representing actions which have *continued* or been *repeated in the past*:

(a) After a simple imperfect, e. g. Gn 2⁶ וַיֵּלֶךְ אָדָם there went up a mist (again and again) from the earth, וַיִּשְׁקָה and watered (as it were, and ever watered afresh), &c. This frequentative use of the perfect consecutive is equally evident after frequentative imperfects, Gn 2¹⁰ וַיְהִי and it became again every time; וַיְהִי would mean, and it became so once for all); 29^{2f.} (four perfects consecutive referring to actions repeated daily); Ex 33⁷⁻¹¹ וַיֵּקֶחַ he used to take at each new encampment the tent, וַיִּטֵּא and to pitch it again every time without the camp; notice, amongst the numerous frequent. perff. consec., the imperf. in vv. 7, 8, 9, 11, always in a frequentative sense; 34^{34f.}, Nu 9^{19,21} (among several simple imperfects), 10¹⁷, Ju 2¹⁹, 1 S 2¹⁹ וַיַּעֲשֶׂה

is only beginning, becoming or still continuing, and hence in any case incomplete. The simplest view is to suppose, that the use of the *perfect consecutive* originated from those cases, in which it had to express the conclusion (or final consequence) of an action which was continued (or repeated) in *past time* (see the examples above), and that this use was afterwards extended to other cases, in which it had to represent the temporal or logical consequence of actions, &c., still in progress, and thus in the end a regular interchange of the two tenses became recognized.

she used to make . . . וְהֵעֱלָתָהּ, and brought it to him from year to year; 27⁹ (וְלָקַח), 1 K 14²⁸, 2 K 3²⁵, 12¹⁵ (in verses 16⁶ imperfects occur again). So also in dependent sentences, Gn 6⁴ (וַיִּלְדוּ) as a continuation of יבאו, Jb 31²⁹.¹

f (β) After an imperfect consecutive, e.g. Ex 39³ (Samaritan וקצצו), 1 S 5⁷ (? see § 112 rr), 7¹⁶, 2 S 15^{2,5}, 16¹³ and he threw stones at him, וַיַּעֲפֹר and cast dust continually; 12^{16,31}, 2 K 6¹⁰, 12^{11 ff. 15}, Jer 37¹³, Jb 1⁵.

g Rem. The frequentative perfect consecutive is sometimes joined even with imperfects consecutive which simply express one single action or occurrence in the past; thus Ex 18²⁶, 40^{31 f.}, 1 S 1⁴, 2 S 15^{1 f.}, 1 K 14²⁷ (cf. verse 28); 1 K 18⁴, 2 K 12¹⁰. For other examples of a loosely connected frequentative perfect consecutive, see below, *dd*.

h (γ) After a perfect, Gn 37³ (לֹא וְעָשָׂה לוֹ), i.e. as often as he needed a new garment)²; Gn 31⁷, Nu 11⁸, 1 S 16¹⁴, 2 K 3⁴, ψ 22⁶; ³ in interrogative sentences, 1 S 26⁹ who has ever, &c.; ψ 80¹³, Jb 1⁴, Ru 4⁷.

i (δ) After an infinitive, Am 1¹¹ עַל-דְּרָבּוֹ because he did pursue his brother, וַיִּשְׁחָת and (on each occasion) did cast off all pity (then an imperfect consecutive); after an infinitive absolute, Jos 6¹³, 2 S 13¹⁹, Jer 23¹⁴.

k (ε) After a participle, Is 6³ (וְהָרָא), &c., frequentative, as a continuation of עֹמְרִים, verse 2); 1 S 2²², 2 S 17¹⁷.⁴

l (ζ) After other equivalents of tenses, e.g. Gn 47²² the priests had a portion from Pharaoh, וַאֲכָלוּ and did eat (year by year), &c.; 1 K 4⁷.

m (b) To express present actions, &c., as the temporal or logical consequence of actions or events which continue or are repeated in the present, especially such as have, according to experience, been at all times frequently repeated, and may be repeated at any time:

(a) After a simple imperfect, e.g. Gn 2²⁴ therefore a man leaves (יָעֻב is accustomed to leave) . . . וַיִּרְבֵּץ and cleaves, &c., here, as frequently elsewhere, clearly with the secondary idea of purpose, i.e. in order to cleave; Is 5¹¹ (if יִהְיֶה is to be taken as a continuation

¹ Also in Ez 44¹² (where Stade, *ZAW.* v. 293, would read וַיִּהְיֶה and וַיִּתְּנוּ) the unusual tenses may have been intentionally chosen: because they continually ministered and so always became afresh . . .

² Driver, on this passage, rightly refers to 1 S 2¹⁹.

³ Am 4⁷ would also come under this head, if וְהִמְטִירַי is really intended, and the statement refers to the past; מְנַעַתִּי might, however, also be a perfect expressing positive assurance (§ 106 m), and the passage would then come under s.

⁴ That וְהִלְבָּתָה, &c., are frequentatives (the maidservant used to go repeatedly and tell them) may be seen from יִלְכוּ (necessarily an imperfect, since it is separated from וְ by הֵם) and וַיִּבְלֻ; on the other hand in verse 18 וַיִּרְא and וַיִּלְכוּ of actions which happened only once.

of (וַיִּלְכְּדוּם); Is 28²⁸, Jer 12³, Ho 4³, 7⁷, ψ 90⁶, Jb 14⁹; also in dependent clauses, Lv 20¹⁸, Is 29^{8.11f.}, Am 5¹⁹.

(β) After a participle, as the equivalent of a sentence representing *n* a contingent action, &c., e.g. Ex 21¹² מִכָּה אִישׁ וָמֵת (instead of מִכָּה there is in verse 20, &c. וְכִי יִכֶּה אִישׁ) *if one smite a man and (so that) he die*, &c., Ex 21¹⁶, Is 29¹⁵, Am 6¹, Hb 2¹².

(γ) After an infinitive absolute, Jer 7^{9f.} *will ye steal, murder, and O commit adultery* (simple infinitives absolute; cf. § 113 ee), וּבֹאֲתֶם *and then come and stand before me . . . and say*, &c.; cf. below, *u*.

(c) To express *future* actions, &c., as the temporal or logical *con-*
sequence of tenses, or their equivalents, which announce or require such future actions or events. Thus—

(α) After imperfects in the sense of a simple future, e.g. Am 9^{3f.} מְשֻׁם אֶחָפֵשׂ וְלִקְחָתִי I *will search and take them out thence*, &c.; Gn 4¹⁴, 40¹³, Ex 7³, 1 S 17³², 2 K 5¹¹, Jb 8^{6f.} (also with a change of subject, Gn 27¹², Ju 6¹⁶, &c.); and in interrogative sentences, Gn 39⁹, Ex 2⁷, 2 S 12¹⁸, 2 K 14¹⁰, Am 8⁸, ψ 41⁶; cf. also Ru 1¹¹; in sentences expressing a wish, 2 S 15⁴; as well as in almost all kinds of dependent clauses. Also in conditional clauses after אִם Gn 32⁹, Ex 19⁵, 1 S 1¹¹, or כִּי Gn 37²⁶, or הֲוֵן Jer 3¹; in final clauses after לְמַעַן Gn 12¹³, Nu 15⁴⁰, Is 28¹³; after אֲנֹכִי Dt 2²⁵, or כִּי Gn 3²², 19¹⁹, 32¹², Is 6¹⁰, Am 5⁶; in temporal clauses, Is 32¹⁵, Jer 13¹⁶; and in relative clauses, Gn 24¹⁴, Ju 1¹², 1 S 17²⁶.

(β) After the jussive (or an imperfect in the sense of a jussive or *q* optative) or cohortative, with the same or a different subject, e.g. Gn 1^{14f.} וְהָיוּ . . . מְאֹרֹת let there be lights . . . and let them be, &c.; Gn 24⁴, 28³, 31⁴⁴, 1 K 1², 22¹³, Ru 2⁷, 1 Ch 22¹¹; after a jussive expressing an imprecation, ψ 109¹⁰.

(γ) After an imperative, also with the same or a different subject, *r*
e.g. 2 S 7⁵ וְאַמְרָתָּ לָהּ go and tell (that thou mayst tell), &c., and often, *perf. consec.* after לָהּ (as also the *perf. consec.* of אָמַר and דָּבַר very frequently follows other imperatives); Gn 6¹⁴, 8¹⁷, 27^{43f.}, 1 S 15^{3.18}, 1 K 2³⁶, Jer 48²⁶.

(δ) After perfects which express a definite expectation or assurance *s*
(cf. § 106 *m* and *n*), e.g. Gn 17²⁰ אֲתָּו וְהִפְרֵתִי אֲתָּו behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, &c.; Is 2¹¹, 5¹⁴; on Am 4⁷ see above, note 3 on *h*; in an interrogative sentence, Ju 9⁹, 11¹³.

(ε) After a participle, e.g. Gn 7⁴ for yet seven days, אֲנִי מְמַטֵּיר *t*
and I will cause it to rain . . . וְיִמְחֵיתִי and I will (i.e. in order to) destroy, &c.; Jer 21⁹; also with a different subject, Gn 24^{43f.} the

maiden which cometh forth (הַיָּצֵאת) . . . , וְאִמְרְתִי אֵלֶיהָ to whom I shall say . . . , וְאִמְרָהּ and she (then) shall say, &c. This use of the perfect consecutive is especially frequent after a participle introduced by הִנֵּה, e.g. Gn 6^{17f.}; with ■ different subject 1 K 20³⁶, Am 6¹⁴; after a complete noun-clause introduced by הִנֵּה (cf. § 140), Ex 3¹³ behold, I come (i.e. if I shall come) . . . , וְאִמְרְתִי לָהֶם and shall say unto them . . . , וְאִמְרוּ and they (then) shall say, &c.; 1 S 14^{8π}, Is 7¹⁴, 8^{7f.}, 39⁶.

u (ζ) After an infinitive absolute, whether the infinitive absolute serves to strengthen the finite verb (see § 113 t), e.g. Is 31⁵, or is used as an emphatic substitute for a cohortative or imperfect (§ 113 dd and ee), e.g. Lv 2⁶, Dt 1¹⁶, Is 5⁵, Ez 23^{46f.}

v (η) After an infinitive construct governed by a preposition (for this change from the infinitive construction to the finite verb, cf. § 114 r), e.g. 1 S 10⁸ לְךָ יְהוֹדַעְתִּי אֶלְיָךְ עַד-בֹּאִי אֵלַיךְ till I come unto thee (prop. until my coming) and show thee, &c.; Gn 18²⁵, 27⁴⁵, Ju 6¹⁸, Ez 39²⁷; cf. 1 K 2^{37.42}.

w Rem. To the same class belong 1 S 14²⁴, where the idea of time precedes, until it be evening and until I be avenged, &c., and Is 5⁵, where the idea of place precedes, in both cases governed by עַד.

x 4. The very frequent use of the perfect consecutive in direct dependence upon other tenses (see above, d-v) explains how it finally obtained a kind of independent force—especially for the purpose of announcing future events—and might depend loosely on sentences to which it stood only in a wider sense in the relation of a temporal or logical consequence. Thus the perfect consecutive is used—

(a) To announce future events, &c., in loose connexion with a further announcement, e.g. Gn 41³⁰ וְקָמוּ and two co-ordinate perfects consecutive, equivalent to *but then shall arise*, &c.; frequently so after הִנֵּה with a following substantive (1 S 9^a), or a participial clause (cf. the analogous instances above, under t), e.g. 1 S 2³¹ behold, the days come, וְגִדַעְתִּי that I will cut off, &c.; Is 39⁶, Am 4², 8¹¹, 9¹³, and very often in Jeremiah; after an expression of time, Ex 17⁴, Is 10²⁵, 29¹⁷, Jer 51³³, Ho 1⁴. Further, when joined to a statement concerning present or past facts, especially when these contain the reason for the action, &c., expressed in the perfect consecutive; cf. Is 6⁷ lo, this hath touched thy lips, וְכָר therefore thine iniquity shall be taken away, &c. (not copulative and it is taken away, since it is parallel with a simple imperfect), Gn 20¹¹, 26²², Ju 13³ (here in an adversative sense); Ho 8¹⁴. In loose connexion with ■ noun-clause, a long succession of perfects consecutive occurs in Ex 6^{6π}. Also in Amos 5²⁶ וְנִשְׁאָתֶם may be an announcement *yea, ye shall take up*; but cf. below, r.

Rem. 1. Very frequently the announcement of a future event is attached *y* by means of וְהָיָה¹ and it shall come to pass (cf. the analogous continuation in the past by means of וַיְהִי, § 111, 2), after which the event announced (sometimes after a long parenthesis) follows in one or more (co-ordinate) perfects consecutive, Gn 9¹⁴, 12¹² (וְהָיָה כִּי = if, as in 46³³, Ex 1¹⁰, 22²⁶ and frequently), 1 K 18¹², Is 14^{3 f.}, Am 8⁹; or in the imperfect, Gn 4¹⁴, Is 2², 3²⁴, 4³, 7^{18.21 ff.} (cf. 29⁸); or in the jussive, Lv 14⁹. It very rarely happens that the verb which is thus loosely added, agrees in gender and number with the following subject, as in Nu 5²⁷, Jer 42¹⁶ וְהָיָה לָהֶם (before הָרָבֶב), and in Jer 42¹⁷ וְהָיָה לָהֶם (before כָּל-הָאֲנָשִׁים).

2. The jussive form וְהָיָה occurs (in the sense described in *y*) instead of וְהָיָה² in 1 S 10⁵, 2 S 5²⁴ (1 Ch 14¹⁵), 1 K 14⁵, Ru 3⁴, although in the first three places a jussive is wholly inadmissible in the context, and even in Ru 3⁴ (where an admonition follows) וְהָיָה would be expected (see below, *bb*). In 1 K 14⁵ the form is a textual error, and the pointing should simply be וְהָיָה. In the other passages וְהָיָה (always before an infinitive with a preposition) stands at the beginning of the sentence at an unusually long distance from the principal tone, and hence is certainly to be explained according to § 109 *k*, except that in 1 S 10⁵, &c., the simply rhythmical jussive form takes the place, not of the full imperfect form, but (exceptionally) of the perfect consecutive.

(*b*) To introduce a command or wish: Dt 10¹⁹ *love ye therefore the aa stranger*; 1 S 6⁵, 24¹⁶, 1 K 2⁶ (in Gn 40¹⁴ the precative perfect consecutive, as elsewhere the cohortative, jussive, and imperative, is strengthened by means of נָא). So, also, in loose connexion with participial and other noun-clauses (see above, *x*), Gn 45^{12 f.}, 1 K 2^{2 f.}, Ru 3^{3 f.}, 3⁹.—In Gn 17¹¹ the perfect consecutive (וַיִּמְלֹאֲהֶם and *ye shall be circumcised*, &c.) is used to explain a preceding command.

Rem. As in the cases mentioned above under *y*, the connexion may be *bb* made by means of וְהָיָה. Thus with a following perfect consecutive, e.g. Gn 46³³, 47²⁴, Ju 4²⁰. Cf. also Gn 24¹⁴, where the real wish, at least as regards the sense, is contained in the next sentence.

(*c*) To introduce a question, whether in loose connexion with *cc* another interrogative sentence (see above, *p*), e.g. Gn 29¹⁵ *art thou my brother* (equivalent to, *Surely thou art*), וַעֲבַדְתָּנִי and *shouldest thou then serve me for naught?* or with a positive statement, e.g. Ex 5⁵ (וְהַשְׁבַּתָּם *will ye then make them rest?*); Nu 16¹⁰, 1 S 25¹¹, and (if it is *Mil'ra'*) ψ 50²¹ (וְהַחֲרַשְׁתִּי).

(*d*) To introduce actions frequently repeated (hence analogous to *dd* the numerous examples of a frequentative perfect consecutive, above, under *e*), e.g. 1 S 1³ (וַעֲלָה) of annual festival journeys); 13²¹ (where, however, the text appears radically corrupt); 27⁹ (וְהָבָה), i.e. every time, therefore continued by means of וְלֹא יִחָיָה); 1 K 5⁷ (וְכִלְבָּלִי),

¹ On the various combinations with וְהָיָה see König's statistics in *ZAW.* xix. 272 ff.

parallel with a simple imperfect); 9²⁵, Jer 25⁴, Ho 12¹¹, Dn 8⁴.—In Jb 1^{4f} a series of frequentative perfects consecutive is interrupted by an imperfect consecutive, while a simple imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae*) forms the conclusion. In Jer 6¹⁷ a similar perfect is expressly marked, by placing the tone on the final syllable (according to § 49 *h*), as parallel with the real perfects consecutive.

ee Rem. The loose connexion of *tempora frequentativa* by וְהָיָה (cf. the Rem. on *y* and *bb*) is also very common in this sense; thus with a following perfect consecutive, Gn 30^{41f}. (but in verse 42^a, where the verb is separated from the *Wāw* by an insertion, we find לֹא יִשְׂמוּ he used not to put them in, according to § 107 *e*); Gn 38⁹, Ex 17¹¹, 33^{7ff}. (see above, *e*), Nu 21⁹, Ju 6³, 19³⁰, 1 S 16²³ (followed by five perfects consecutive); 2 S 15⁵; with a following imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae*), Ju 2¹⁹, 2 S 14^{2a}.—In Ju 12^{5f}, וְהָיָה, contrary to what would be expected, is continued by means of the imperfect consecutive, and in 1 S 13²² by לֹא יִלְכֹּץ with the perfect (instead of the imperfect).

ff 5. Finally the perfect consecutive is very frequently employed with a certain emphasis to introduce the apodosis after sentences (or their equivalents) which contain a condition, a reason, or a statement of time. Such an apodosis, as in the cases already treated, may represent either future events, or commands and wishes, or even events which have been often repeated in the past. Thus—

(a) The perfect consecutive occurs in the apodosis to conditional sentences¹ (§ 159 *g, o, s*):

(a) After אִם with the imperfect, e. g. 2 K 7^{4b} וּמָתוּ אִם-יָמִיתֵנוּ if they kill us, (well then) we shall but die; here the perfect consecutive is used obviously with greater emphasis than the imperfect (וְהָיָה) which immediately precedes; Gn 18²⁶, 24^{3,41}, 32⁹, Nu 30¹⁵, Ju 4²⁰, 1 S 11¹, 20⁶, 1 K 3¹⁴, Na 3¹², Ec 4¹¹.

gg (β) After אִם with the perfect (in the sense of a *futurum exactum*), Nu 5²⁷, 2 K 5²⁰, 7^{4a}, Is 4^{4f}; as precative apodosis after אִם-נָא with the perf. preteritum, Gn 33¹⁰; as a frequentative perfect consecutive, to represent past events in the apodosis after אִם with a perfect, Gn 38⁹, Nu 21⁹, Ju 6³, Jb 7⁴; after אִם with imperfect, Gn 31⁸.

hh (γ) After כִּי (in case, suppose that) with the imperfect, Gn 12¹², Ex 18¹⁶, Ju 13¹⁷, Is 58⁷, Ez 14¹³.² Frequentative with reference to the past, after כִּי with frequentative perfect, Ju 2¹⁸, Jb 7^{13f}.

¹ In a number of the examples of this kind the protasis is already loosely connected by means of וְהָיָה, and hence some of them had to be already mentioned above, under *y, bb, ee*.

² In 1 S 24¹⁹ a question appears to be expressed by the perfect consecutive, for if a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away? Probably, however, with Klostermann, וְיָבִי should be read for וְיָבִי.

(δ) After אֲשֶׁר with the imperfect, Gn 44⁹ וְיָמָת . . . אֹתוֹ *ii* with whomsoever . . . it be found, let him die; with the perfect, Ex 21¹³ and if a man lie not in wait, &c.; Ju 1¹².

(ε) Very frequently after a perfect consecutive (one or more) containing the condition, e. g. Gn 44²⁹ וְלִקְחֶתֶם גַּם-אֶת-יוֹהָרָתִים . . . וְהוֹרִדְתֶּם *kk* and if ye take (or shall have taken) this one also . . . ye shall bring down, &c.; cf. Gn 33¹³, 42³⁸, 44^{4,22}, 47⁸⁰, Nu 30¹², Ru 2⁹, and probably also Ez 39²⁸.—Also frequentative in reference to the past, e. g. 1 S 17^{34f.} . . . וַיָּבֹא הַלֵּוֹיִּי *ii* and when there came (as sometimes happened) a lion . . . I went out, &c.; Ex 33¹⁰, Nu 10^{17ff.}, 1 K 18¹⁰, Jer 20⁹ (the perfects consecutive being regularly continued in the apodosis by וְלֵא with an imperfect¹).

Rem. The perfect consecutive may be used also in the protasis to express *ll* a condition when the employment of the perfect consecutive in the apodosis has become impossible, owing to an emphatic word having to stand before it; thus in Ez 14¹⁴ on account of הִנֵּפֶה; 33⁴ on account of דָּמּוֹ.—In 1 S 14⁵² the imperfect consecutive, contrary to what might be expected, stands in the apodosis, and when Saul saw any . . . valiant man, he took him unto him, where וַיִּצְלָחֵהוּ suggests the special case, rather than a repeated occurrence; cf. 2 S 15². Conversely, in 1 S 2¹⁶ (וַיֹּאמֶר perhaps a mere mistake for וַיִּצְלַח), 17^{35b} an imperfect consecutive stands in the protasis.

(ζ) After various equivalents of sentences, which contain a condition; *mm* thus, after a substantive standing absolutely, or a participle (a *casus pendens*), Gn 17¹⁴ וְנִכְרְתָהּ . . . וְעָרַל זָכָר *ii* and the uncircumcised male (in case such an one be found), he shall be cut off, &c.; cf. Gn 30³², Ex 12¹⁵, 2 S 14¹⁰, Is 6¹³, and (after an infinitive with a preposition) 2 S 7¹⁴; in a wider sense also Ex 4²¹, 9¹⁹, 12⁴⁴, Is 9¹, 56⁵.

(b) The perfect consecutive serves as the apodosis to causal clauses; *nn* thus e. g. after כִּי with the perfect, Is 3^{16f.}; after אֲשֶׁר with perfect, 1 K 20⁵⁸; after עַקֵּב with perfect, Nu 14²⁴; also after what are equivalent to causal clauses, e. g. ψ 25¹¹ (וְסִלַּחְתָּ) . . . לְמַעַן שְׁמֶךָ *for thy name's sake . . . pardon . . .*; Is 37²⁹ after עַל with an infinitive.

(c) The perfect consecutive occurs as the apodosis to temporal *oo* clauses or their equivalents, e. g. 1 S 2¹⁵ וַבֹּא . . . אֶת-הַחֶלֶב *ii* בְּאֶרֶם יִקְטְרוּ before they burnt the fat, the priest's servant came (used to come), &c., hence a frequentative perfect consecutive relating to the past, as in Ex 1¹⁹; also after participial clauses (§ 116 w), e. g. 1 S 2^{13f.} וַבֹּא . . . בְּלִאִישׁ זָבַח *when(ever) any man offered sacrifice, then came,*

¹ In all these examples (not only in the frequentative perfects consecutive) the original idea of the perfect, which also underlies the perfect consecutive, comes out very distinctly. Gn 44²⁹ (see above) implies in the mind of the speaker, If it ever shall have come to this, that ye have taken this one also, then ye have thereby brought me down to Sheol.

&c. (so Ju 19³⁰, 2 S 20¹²), with a frequentative perfect consecutive. The perfect consecutive is very frequently used to announce future actions or events after simple expressions of time of any kind; thus Gn 3⁵, Ex 32³⁴ (after *וַיִּבֶן* with the infinitive), cf. also such examples as Gn 44³¹, Ju 16², Jos 6¹⁰, 1 S 1²², 16²³ (numerous frequentative perfects consecutive after the infinitive with a preposition; so 2 S 15⁵, see above, *ee*); 1 S 20¹⁸, 2 S 14²⁶, 15¹⁰, Is 18⁵; moreover, Ex 17⁴, Is 10²⁵, 29¹⁷, 37²⁶; even after single disconnected words, e.g. Ex 16⁶ *וַיָּרֶב עַרְבָּתְךָ* at even (when it becomes evening) then ye shall know; cf. verse 7, Lv 7¹⁶, 1 K 13³¹, Pr 24²⁷.

pp 6. Finally there still remains a number of passages which cannot be classed with any of those hitherto mentioned. Of these, some are due to the influence of Aramaic modes of expression, while in others the text is evidently corrupt.¹ In a few instances we can do no more than merely call attention to the incorrectness of the expression. (We are not of course concerned here with the cases—usually occurring in dependent clauses—in which a 2nd pers. *perf.* with Wāw copulative is simply co-ordinate with what precedes, as in Gn 28⁶, and probably Nu 21¹⁵, Dt 33².)

(a) The influence of the Aramaic construction of the perfect with *ו* as the narrative tense, instead of the Hebrew imperfect consecutive (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 71 b), is certainly to be traced in *Qoheleth*, and sporadically in other very late books,² perhaps also in a few passages in the books of Kings, which are open to the suspicion of being due to later interpolation; so probably 1 K 12³² *וַהֲעִמִּיר*; 2 K 11¹ *וַרְאָתָה*; 14¹⁴ *וַלָּקָה* (in the parallel passage, 2 Ch 25²⁴, the word is wanting); 2 K 23⁴ *וַנִּשָּׂא*, &c.; verse 10 *וַנִּטְמָא*, &c.; verse 12 *וַהֲשִׁילָהּ*, &c.; verse 15 *וַשְׁרָה*, &c.³ Cf. also Ez 37^{2,7,10}.

qq (b) The text is certainly corrupt in Is 40⁶ (read with the LXX and Vulgate

¹ Mayer Lambert, *REJ.* xxvi. 55, is probably right in pointing some of these forms as *infin. abs.* instead of *perfects*.

² In the whole of *Qoheleth* the imperfect consecutive occurs only in 1¹⁷ and 4^{1,7}. Several of the perfects with *ו* can no doubt be explained as frequentatives, e.g. 1¹³, 2^{5,9,11,13,15}, 5¹⁸, compared with 6²; but this is impossible in such passages as 9^{14 ff.} In *Ezra*, Driver reckons only six examples of the historical perfect with *ו*, in *Nehemiah* only six, and in *Esther* six or seven.

³ Stade in *ZAW.* v. 291 ff. and in *Ausgewählte akad. Reden*, Giessen, 1899, p. 194 ff. and appendix p. 199, discusses, in connexion with 2 K 12¹², a number of critically questionable perfects with *ו*. He considers that the whole section, 2 K 23⁴ from *וַנִּשָּׂא* to verse 5 inclusive, is to be regarded as a gloss, since the continuation of an imperfect consecutive by means of a perfect with *ו* never occurs in pre-exilic documents, except in places where it is due to corruption of the original text. The theory of frequentative perfects consecutive (even immediately after imperfects consecutive), which has been supported above, under *f* and *g*, by a large number of examples, is quite inconsistent with the character of the action in 2 K 23⁵ *וַהֲשִׁבִית*, verse 8 *וַנִּתֵּן*, and verse 14 *וַשְׁבֵּר*.

וְאָמַר; Jer 38²⁸, where the narrative breaks off in the middle of the sentence; 40³ (וְהָיָה, &c., wanting in the LXX); also in Ju 7¹³ וְנִפְלָה הָאֵהָל is altogether redundant; in 1 S 3¹³ read, with Klostermann, the 2nd sing. masc. instead of וְהִגְדִּיתִי; in 1 K 21¹² וְהִשִּׁיבוּ is, no doubt, incorrectly repeated from verse 9, where it is an imperative.

Of other questionable instances, (a) the following, at any rate, may also be explained as frequentatives, Gn 21²⁵, 49²³, Ex 36³⁸, 38²⁸, 39³, 1 S 5⁷, 17²⁰, 24¹¹ (but even so וְאָמַר would be expected); 2 K 23¹², Is 28²⁰ (parallel with an imperfect); Am 5²⁶ (unless it is rather, *yea, ye shall take up*; see above, x); ψ 26³, Ez 8³⁶.

(β) A longer or constant continuance in a past state is perhaps represented SS by the perfect with וְ (as a variety of the frequentative perfect with וְ), in Gn 15⁶, 34⁶, Nu 21²⁰, Jos 9¹², 22^{3b}, Is 22¹⁴, Jer 3⁹. But the unusual *perfects consec.* in Jos 15³⁻¹¹, 16²⁻⁸ (ultimately parallel with an imperf. as in 17⁹, 18²⁰, 18¹²⁻²¹, 19^{11-14.22.26-29.34}, are without doubt rightly explained by Bennett (*SBOT.*, Joshua, p. 23) as originally containing the directions either of God to Joshua or of Joshua to the people; cf. the evident trace of this in 15^{1b}. A redactor transformed the directions into a description but left the *perfects consec.*, which are to be explained as in *aa*. In the same way וְהָיָה Ex 36²⁹ is most simply explained as repeated from 26²⁵.

(γ) The following are due to errors in the text, or to incorrect modes of *tt* expression: Ex 36^{29f}, Ju 3²³, 16¹⁸ (read וְנִעְלָה), 1 S 4¹⁹, 17³⁸, 2 S 16⁵, 19^{18f}. (read וְעָלָה and וְעָבְרוּ), 1 K 3¹¹ (where וְשָׁאֵלָה is, no doubt intentionally, assimilated to the four other perfects); 13³, 20²¹; 2 K 14⁷ (where, with Stade, וְאֶת־הַפֶּלֶעַ should be read); 14¹⁴, 18⁴ (where, at any rate, וְשָׁבַר might be taken as a frequentative, but not וּכְרַת, &c.; evidently the perfects are co-ordinated only in form with הָיָה הַקִּיר); 18³⁰, 21¹⁵, 24¹⁴, Jer 37¹⁵ (where וְהָבֹה, but not וְנָתַנִּי, might be frequentative); Ez 9⁷ (omit וְיִצְאָה with Stade, and read וְהָבֹה); 20²² (וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי *Mil'el* before an imperfect consecutive); Am 7⁴ (וְאָכְלָה after an imperfect consecutive); Jb 16¹².

Finally, in 1 S 1¹², 10⁹, 17⁴⁸, 25²⁰, 2 S 6¹⁶, 2 K 3¹⁵, Jer 37¹¹, Am 7² וְהָיָה is to be *uu* read throughout instead of וְהָיָה, but in Gn 38⁵ וְהָיָה with the LXX.

B. THE INFINITIVE AND PARTICIPLE.

§ 113. *The Infinitive Absolute.*

Cf. the dissertation of J. Kahan, and, especially, the thorough investigation by E. Sellin, both entitled, *Ueber die verbal-nominale Doppelnatur der hebräischen Participien und Infinitive*, &c., Lpz. 1889; F. Prätorius, 'Ueber die sogen. Infinit. absol. des Hebr.' in *ZDMG.* 1902, pp. 546 ff.

1. The infinitive absolute is employed according to § 45 to emphasize *a* the idea of the verb in the abstract, i.e. it speaks of an action (or state) without any regard to the agent or to the circumstances of time and mood under which it takes place. As the name of an action the infinitive absolute, like other nouns in the stricter sense,

¹ Or does וְנִעְלָה, as a frequentative, imply fastening with several bolts? It is, at all events, to be noticed, that in 2 S 13¹⁸ also וְנִעְלָה follows an imperfect consecutive.

may form part of certain combinations (as a subject, predicate, or object, or even as a genitive,¹ see below); but such a use of the infinitive absolute (instead of the infinitive construct with or without a preposition) is, on the whole, rare, and, moreover, open to question on critical grounds. On the other hand, the infinitive absolute frequently exhibits its character as an expression of the *verbal idea* by taking an object, either in the accusative or even with a preposition.

b Examples of the use of the infinitive absolute:—

(a) As subject, Pr 25²⁷ אָכַל רֶבֶשׁ הָרְבוֹת לֹא טוֹב *it is not good to eat much honey*; Jer 10⁵, Jb 6²⁵, Ec 4¹⁷; epexegetically, after a demonstrative pronoun, Is 58^{5f.}, Ze 14¹².

c (b) As predicate, Is 32¹⁷ and the effect of righteousness (is) הַשָּׁקֵט וְנָחָה *quietness (prop. to find rest) and confidence*.

d (c) As object, Is 1¹⁷ לִמְדוּ הַיָּטִב *learn to do well*; Is 7¹⁵, Pr 15¹², Jb 9¹⁸; according to the sense also Jer 9²³ 23¹⁴, as well as Is 5⁵ (הָיָה and פָּרַץ virtually depend on the idea of the wish contained in עֲשֵׂהָ); Is 22¹², where a long series of infinitives absolute is governed by הָיָה, and 59¹³ (six infinitives governed by יִרְעֻנִים in verse 12); Dt 28⁵⁶ is strange since the object precedes the infinitive absolute which governs it,² also Is 42²⁴, where the statement of place precedes the infinitive absolute.—In Jer 9⁴, Jb 13³ the infinitive absolute as the object of the verb is placed before it for the sake of emphasis (with the verb negated by לֹא in Is 57²⁰, Jer 49²³), so also in La 3⁴⁵ where it is the remoter object and co-ordinated with a substantive.

e (d) As genitive, Is 14²³ בְּמִטְאֵמָה הַשְׁמֵר *with the besom of destruction*; so perhaps also 4⁴ בָּרוּךְ בְּעֵר *cf. further, Pr 1³, 21¹⁶*. The infinitive absolute is never used in immediate connexion with prepositions³ (which as being originally substantives govern the genitive), but always the infinitive construct; but if a second infinitive is co-ordinated by וְ with such an infinitive construct, it has the form of the infinitive absolute (since it is released from the immediate government of the preposition), e.g. 1 S 22¹³ . . . לָהֶם לִי בִתְתֶךָ *in that thou hast given him bread . . . and hast enquired of God for him*; Ez 36³; 1 S 25^{26.33} (after מִן); after לְ Ex 32⁶, Jer 7¹⁸, 44¹⁷.

f (e) Governing an accusative of the object, e.g. Is 22¹³ הָרַג בָּקָר וְשָׁחַט צֹאן *slaying oxen and killing sheep*; cf. Ex 20⁸, 23³⁰, Dt 5¹², Is 37¹⁹, Ez 23³⁰, and of the examples in a-d, Dt 28⁵⁶, Is 5⁵, 58^{6f.}, Pr 25²⁷, &c.; followed by a preposition, e.g. Is 7¹⁵ מָאֹס בָּרַע וּבָחַר בְּטוֹב *to refuse the evil and choose the good*; Pr 15¹² (הוֹבִיחַ לוֹ).

g If the object be a personal pronoun, then, since the infinitive absolute can never be united with a suffix (see the note on a), it is affixed by means of the accusative-sign אֶת (את), e.g. Jer 9²³ יָרְדֻעַ אֹתִי *and knoweth me*; Ez 36³.

¹ The infinitive absolute can never be joined with a genitive or a pronominal suffix.

² Perhaps הָיָה according to § 53 k should be explained as an infinitive construct, or should be written הָיָה.

³ וְאֶחָדִי שָׁחַח 1 S 19 is impossible Hebrew, and as the LXX shows, a late addition.

2. Analogous to the use of the infinitive absolute as the accusative *h* of the object, mentioned in *d*, is its employment as a *casus adverbialis*¹ in connexion with some form of the finite verb, to describe more particularly the manner or attendant circumstances (especially those of time and place) under which an action or state has taken place, or is taking place, or will take place; e.g. Jer 22¹⁹ *he shall be buried with the burial of an ass*, סָחַב וְהִשְׁלַךְ *a drawing and casting forth*, i. e. being drawn and cast forth, &c.; Gn 21¹⁶ (הִרְחֵק *a removing*, i. e. distant; cf. Ex 33⁷, Jos 3¹⁶); Gn 30³², Ex 30³⁶, Nu 6^{5.23}, 15³⁵ (where a subject is added subsequently; see below, *gg*); Jos 3¹⁷, 1 S 13¹² (הָחַל וְכָלָה *a beginning and ending*, i. e. from beginning to end); 2 S 8², Is 7¹¹ (הַעֲמֵק and הַגְבִּיהַ, prop. *a making deep . . .*, and *a making high*, i. e. whether thy request extend to the world below or to the height above); 57¹⁷ (הִסְתֵּר *in hiding*, sc. my face); Jer 3¹⁵ (וְהִשְׁבִּיל *with knowledge and understanding*); Hb 3¹³ (עֲרוֹת, for the form cf. § 75 *aa*); Zc 7³, ψ 35¹⁶ (הָרִק, to define more precisely קִרְעֵי verse 15); Jb 15³.²

Rem. 1. To an adverbial infinitive absolute of this kind, there may further *i* be added a *casus adverbialis* (the accusative of state or circumstance), or even a circumstantial clause, to define more exactly the manner in which the action is performed, e.g. Is 20² *and he did so* הָלַךְ עָרוֹם וְיָחָף *walking naked and barefoot*, prop. in the condition of one naked, &c.; Is 30¹⁴ *a breaking in pieces* (acc. to the reading כָּתוֹת; the Masora requires כָּתוֹת) *without sparing*.

2. A few infinitives of this kind, all of which are in Hiph'il, have, through *k* frequent use, come to be treated by the language as simple adverbs; so especially הִרְבֵּה (cf. § 75 *f*) *multum faciendo*, i. e. *multum*, very frequently strengthened by מְאֹד *very* and even used without connexion with a finite verb (see the Lexicon); also הֵיטֵב *bene faciendo*, i. e. *bene*, used especially to express the careful and thorough performance of an action (e.g. Dt 13¹⁵); in Dt 9²¹, 27⁸ it is added epexegetically to another adverbial infinitive absolute, in Jon 4⁹ it twice precedes the verb for the sake of emphasis. Finally, הִשְׁבִּחַ *mane faciendo*, i. e. *early in the morning*, then in general *early* with the additional idea of earnestness; in 1 S 17¹⁶ joined with the infinitive absolute וְהָעָרַב *a denominative from עָרַב evening (morning and evening, i. e. early and late)*, elsewhere (with the exception of Pr 27¹⁴) always joined with the infinitive absolute of the governing verb, e.g. Jer 11⁷ *for I earnestly protested* (וְהָעֵרָתִי) *unto your fathers . . .* וְהָשַׁבַּח *rising early and protesting*, i. e. with earnest protestation; Jer 25⁵, 26⁵ (where ל should be omitted before ה'); Jer 29¹⁹, 32³³, 2 Ch 16¹⁵.

¹ That this *casus adverbialis* also was originally regarded as an accusative, may be seen from classical Arabic, where an infinitive of this kind expressly retains the accusative ending. In Latin the ablative of the gerund corresponds in many ways to this use of the infinitive absolute.

² Also in 2 K 21¹³ for מָחָה וְהָפַךְ read with Stade and Klostermann מָחָה וְהָפַךְ; similarly, with Stade, וְקָשָׁה in Ju 4²⁴, וְחִזֹּק in Jer 23¹⁴, and on Is 31⁵ cf. *t*.

l 3. The infinitive absolute occurs most frequently in immediate connexion with the finite verb of the same stem, in order in various ways to define more accurately or to strengthen the idea of the verb.¹

m These infinitives absolute joined immediately to the finite verb belong in a sense to the *schema etymologicum* treated in § 117 p, i.e. they are objects of the finite verb in question, except that the infinitive absolute (as a *nomen abstractum*) lays stress rather on the actual occurrence or the energy of the action (see the examples below), while the noun proper emphasizes the result or extent of the action; cf. e.g. Ex 22²² אִם-צָעַק יִצְעַק אֵלַי if it actually happens that he cries to me, with Gn 27³⁴ (as it were, he cried, so that a great cry was heard).

We must further distinguish—

n (a) The infinitive absolute used before the verb to strengthen the verbal idea, i.e. to emphasize in this way either the certainty (especially in the case of threats) or the forcibleness and completeness of an occurrence. In English, such an infinitive is mostly expressed by a corresponding adverb, but sometimes merely by putting greater stress on the verb; e.g. Gn 2¹⁷ מוֹת תָּמוּת thou shalt surely die, cf. 18^{10,18}, 22¹⁷, 28²², 1 S 9⁶ (cometh surely to pass); 24²¹, Am 5⁵, 7¹⁷, Hb 2³, Zc 11¹⁷; with the infinitive strengthened by אָף Gn 44²⁸ (but 27³⁰ and Jacob was yet scarce gone out, &c.); Gn 43³ הָעֵד הָעֵד בָּנוּ he did solemnly protest unto us; 1 S 20⁶ נִשְׁאַל נִשְׁאַל David earnestly asked leave of me; Jos 17¹³, Ju 1²³ וְחָרִישׁ לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ and did not utterly drive them out; especially typical instances are Am 9⁸ I will destroy it from off the face of the earth לֹא הֲשִׁימִיר אֲשַׁמִּיר וג' saving that I will not utterly destroy, &c.; Jer 30¹¹ and will in no wise leave thee unpunished; cf. further Gn 20¹⁸, 1 K 3²⁶, Jo 1⁷, Jb 13⁵.

o The infinitive absolute is used before the verb with less emphasis:

(1) Frequently at the beginning of the statement; cf. Driver on 1 S 20⁶. However, in these cases a special emphasis on the following verb is sometimes intended; cf. above, *n*, on Gn 43³, 1 S 20⁶; also Gn 3¹⁶, 26²⁸, 32¹⁷, 1 S 14²³, 20³. Elsewhere the infinitive absolute is evidently used only as possessing a certain fullness of sound (hence for rhythmical reasons, like some uses of the separate pronoun, § 135 a), as in Gn 15¹³, 43^{7,20}, Ju 9⁸, 1 S 10¹⁶, 23¹⁰, 2 S 1⁶, 20¹⁸.

(2) Very frequently in conditional sentences after אִם, &c. The infinitive absolute in this case emphasizes the importance of the con-

¹ Cf. A. Rieder, *Die Verbindung des Inf. abs. mit dem Verb. fin. . . im Hebr.*, Lpz., 1872; also his *Quae ad syntaxin Hebraicam . . . planiorem faciendam ex lingua Graeca et Latina afferantur*, Gumbinnen (Programm des Gymnasiums), 1884. G. R. Hauschild, *Die Verbindung finiter und infinitiver Verbalformen desselben Stammes in einigen Bibelsprachen*, Frankfurt a. M., 1893, discussing especially the rendering of such constructions in the Greek and Latin versions.

dition on which some consequence depends, e.g. Ex 15²⁶ *if thou wilt diligently hearken, &c.*, Ex 19⁵, 21⁵, 22^{3, 11 f. 16. 22} (see above, *m*); 23²², Nu 21², Ju 16¹¹, 1 S 11¹, 12²⁵; after לִי 1 S 14³⁰.

The infinitive absolute is used to give emphasis to an antithesis, e.g. *p* 2 S 24²⁴ *nay; but I will verily buy* (קָנוּ אֶתְּךָ) *it of thee, &c.* (not receive it as a gift); Ju 15¹³ *no; but we will bind thee fast . . . but surely we will not kill thee*; cf. further Gn 31³⁰ (thou art indeed gone =) *though thou wouldst needs be gone* (Vulg. *esto*), *because thou sore longedst, &c.*; ψ 118^{13. 18}, 126⁶ (the second infinitive absolute as a supplement to the first—see below, *r*—comes after the verb).—Hence also, as permissive, Gn 216^f. תֹּאכַל חֵלֶב *thou mayest freely eat, but, &c.* (so that verse 16 is in antithesis to verse 17); or concessive, 1 S 2³⁰ *I said indeed . . .*, 14⁴³.

The infinitive absolute is used to strengthen a question, and *q* especially in impassioned or indignant questions, e.g. Gn 37⁸ הֲמִלְכָה עָלֵינוּ *shalt thou indeed reign over us?* Gn 37¹⁰, 43⁷, Ju 11²⁵, 1 S 2²⁷, 2 S 19⁴³, Jer 3¹, 13¹², Ez 28⁹, Am 3⁵, Zc 7⁵; but cf. also Gn 24⁵ *must I needs bring again?*

(*b*) The infinitive absolute after the verb, sometimes (as in *n*) to *r* intensify¹ the idea of the verb (especially after imperatives and participles, since the infinitive absolute can never precede either, e.g. Nu 11¹⁵, Jb 13¹⁷, 21², 37² שָׁמְעוּ שְׁמָעוּ *hearken ye attentively*; Jer 22¹⁰; after participles, e.g. Is 22¹⁷, also elsewhere, e.g. Nu 23¹¹, 24¹⁰ *thou hast altogether blessed them*; Jos 24¹⁰, 2 K 5¹¹, Dn 11¹⁰, and with the infinitive absolute strengthened by means of בְּ Gn 31¹⁵, 46⁴, Nu 16¹³); sometimes to express the long *continuance* of an action; here again after an imperative, Is 6⁹ שְׁמָעוּ שְׁמָעוּ *hear ye continually*; after a perfect, Jer 6²⁹; after a participle, Jer 23¹⁷; after an imperfect consecutive, Gn 19⁹, Nu 11³².

To this class belong especially those cases in which a second infinitive absolute is co-ordinated with the first; the latter then expresses either an accompanying or antithetical action or the aim to which the principal action is directed; e.g. 1 S 6¹⁷ הֹלְכֵי הָלָכוּ וְנָעוּ *lowing as they went* (lowing continually; so after a participle, Jos 6^{13b} *Qerê*); Gn 8⁷ *it went forth to and fro*²; Is 19²² *smiting and* (i. e. but also) *healing again*; Jo 2²⁶ (see above, *m*).

Rem. 1. Instead of a second infinitive absolute (see above) there is sometimes found a perfect consecutive (Jos. 6^{13a} and 2 S 13¹⁹ [but Stade's וַיַּעַן is

¹ In Arabic also, the intensifying infinitive regularly stands after the verb, but in Syriac before the verb.

² Also in Ez 1¹⁴ for the distorted form רָצוּא reads simply יָצוּא יָצוּא.

is preferable], in both places as perfect frequentative; Is 31⁵ referring to the future, unless with Stade, *ZAW.* vi. 189, we read וְהָצִיל and וְהִמְלִיט, or an imperfect consecutive (1 S 19²³, 2 S 16¹³) or participle (2 S 16⁶); cf. also *u.*

- u 2. The idea of long *continuance* is very frequently expressed by the verb הָלַךְ to go, along with its infinitive absolute, or even by the latter alone, and this occurs not only when it can be taken in its literal sense (*to go, to walk*, as in the examples given above, Jos 6^{9,13}, 1 S 6¹², 2 S 3¹⁶, 13¹⁹; cf. also, Is 3¹⁶, where both infinitives stand *before* the verb, and ψ 126⁶, where הָלוֹךְ precedes), but also in cases where הָלַךְ in the sense of *to go on, to continue*, merely performs the function of an adverb. The action itself is added in a second infinitive absolute, or sometimes (see above, *t*) in a participle or verbal adjective. Examples, Gn 8³ וַיָּשָׁבוּ הַמַּיִם . . . הָלוֹךְ וְשׁוֹב and the waters returned . . . continually; Gn 8⁵, 12⁹, Ju 14⁹, 2 K 2¹¹; with a participle following, Jer 41⁶ (unless we read וַיִּבְכֶּה, as in 2 S 3¹⁶); with an adjective following, Gen 26¹³, Ju 4²⁴, 1 S 14¹⁹, 2 S 5¹⁰ (1 Ch 11⁹), 2 S 15²⁵.¹

On the other hand, in 1 S 17⁴¹ the participle הֹלֵךְ is used instead of the infinitive absolute. Of a different kind are the instances in which the participle הֹלֵךְ is used as predicate along with the co-ordinate adjective (Ex 19¹⁹, 1 S 2²⁶, 2 S 3¹, 15¹², Est 9⁴, 2 Ch 17¹²) or participle (1 S 17¹⁵, Jon 1¹¹, Pr 4¹⁸, Ec 1⁶).

- v 3. The regular place of the negative is between the intensifying infinitive absolute and the finite verb,² e.g. Ex 5²³ וְהָצַל לֹא-הֵצַלְתָּ neither hast thou delivered at all, Ju 15¹³, Jer 13¹², 30¹¹; cf. Mi 1¹⁰ (אֵל). Exceptions are Gn 3⁴ (where the negation of the threat pronounced in 2¹⁷ is expressed in the same form of words); Am 9⁸, ψ 49⁸.

- w 4. With a finite verb of one of the derived conjugations, not only the infinitive absolute of the same conjugation may be connected (Gn 28²² Pi'el; 17¹³, Ex 22³, Ez 14³ Niph'al; Gn 40¹⁵ Pu'al; Ho 4¹⁸ Hiph'il; Ez 16⁴ Hoph'al), but also (especially with Niph'al, rarely with Pi'el and Hiph'il; see Driver on 2 S 20¹⁸) that of Qal as the simplest and most general representative of the verbal idea, 2 S 20¹⁸ (with Pi'el; but in Gn 37³³, 44²⁸ טָרַף is a passive of Qal, § 52 *e*); 46⁴ (with Hiph'il); Ex 19¹³, 21²⁰, 2 S 23⁷, Is 40³⁰, Jer 10⁵, Jb 6² (with Niph'al); Is 24¹⁹ (with Hithpo'el; רָעָה in the same verse must also, according to the Masora, certainly be the infinitive absolute Qal; see § 67 *c*), and so always מוֹת יָמָת he shall surely be put to death. Elsewhere the infinitive absolute of a conjugation with kindred meaning is found, Lv 19²⁰, 2 K 3²³ Hoph'al for Niph'al (but most probably we should read, with Driver, the *infin. Niph.* in both places, הִפְרָה and הִתְחַרַּב); 1 S 2¹⁶ (Pi'el for Hiph'il, unless יִקְמְרוּן is to be read); Ez 16⁴ (Hoph'al for Pu'al).³ Finally, the infinitive absolute may

¹ Cf. in French, *Le mal va toujours croissant, la maladie va toujours en augmentant et en empirant*, 'continually increases and becomes worse and worse.'

² Cf. Rieder, *Quo loco ponantur negationes* לֹא et אֵל . . . (*Zeitschrift für Gymn.-Wesen*, 1879, p. 395 ff.).

³ In three passages even the infinitive absolute of another stem of like sound occurs; but in Is 28²⁸ אָרָשׁ is no doubt a mere textual error for דָּוַשׁ, and in Jer 8¹³, according to § 72 *aa*, we should read אָסַפְּם, and in Zp 1² אָסַף. Barth, *Nom.-bildung*, § 49 *b*, sees in אָרָשׁ and אָסוּף infinitives Hiph'il, exactly corresponding in form to 'a^qām[ā] the Aram. infin. 'Aph'el of קִים; but there is no more evidence for a *Hiph.* of דָּוַשׁ in Hebrew than for a stem אָרַשׁ.

equally well be represented by a *substantive* of kindred stem.¹ In Is 29¹⁴ the substantive intensifying the verb is found *along with* the infinitive absolute.

5. Instead of the infinitive absolute immediately connected with the finite *x* verb, an infinitive construct form appears (cf. § 73 *d*), in Nu 23²⁵ (נָם לָב); cf. Ru 2¹⁶ (נָם שָׁל); Jer 50³⁴ (רִיב יָרִיב); Pr 23¹ (בֵּין תִּבְיִן). In the last instances the infinitive is probably assimilated to the imperfect, like the infinitive Niph'al in the forms noticed in § 51 *k* and note.—Cf. also 2 K 3²⁴ (יִבְּאוּ בָּא וְהַבּוֹת) (read so with the LXX) before א, hence, no doubt due to the dislike of a hiatus; so in ψ 50²¹, Neh 1⁷ (תִּבְלֵ), all in rapid style; *after* the verb, Jos 7⁷, unless הִעָּבִיר is intended.

4. Finally the infinitive absolute sometimes appears as a *substitute y* for the finite verb, either when it is sufficient simply to mention the verbal idea (see *z*), or when the hurried or otherwise excited style intentionally contents itself with this infinitive, in order to bring out the verbal idea in a clearer and more expressive manner (see *aa*).

(a) The infinitive absolute as the continuation of a preceding finite *z* verb. In the later books especially it often happens that in a succession of several acts only the first (or sometimes more) of the verbs is inflected, while the second (or third, &c.) is added simply in the infinitive absolute. Thus after several perfects, Dn 9⁵ (cf. verse 11) *we have sinned . . . and have transgressed thy law*, וְסוֹר; *and have turned aside* (prop. *a turning aside* took place); so after a perfect Ex 36⁷ (?), 1 S 2²⁸, Is 37¹⁹, Jer 14⁵, 19¹³, Hag 1⁶ (four infinitives), Zc 3⁴ (but read with Wellhausen, after the LXX, וְהִלַּכְשִׁי אִתּוֹ), 7⁵, Ec 8⁹, 9¹¹, Est 3¹³, 9^{6, 16, 18}, 12^{6ff.}, Neh 9^{8, 13}, 1 Ch 5²⁰, 2 Ch 28¹⁹; ² after the perfect consecutive, Zc 12¹⁰; after the perfect frequentative 1 K 9²⁵ (unless וְהִקְטִיר be intended); after the simple imperfect, Lv 25¹⁴, Nu 30³, Jer 32⁴⁴ (three infinitives), 36²³, 1 Ch 21²⁴; after a cohortative, Jos 9²⁰; after the imperfect consecutive, Gn 41⁴³ (as a continuation of וַיִּרְבֶּב); Ex 8¹¹, Ju 7¹⁹, Jer 37²¹, Neh 8⁸, 1 Ch 16³⁶, 2 Ch 7³; with אִו or after the jussive, Dt 14²¹, Est 2³, 6⁹; after the imperative, Is 37^{30b}, Am 4^{4c}; after the participle, Hb 2¹⁵ (strengthened by אִף, and regarded, like the participle itself, as an adverbial accusative); Est 8⁸.

(b) At the beginning of the narrative, or at least of a new section *aa* of it. The special form of the finite verb which the infinitive absolute represents must be determined from the context. The infinitive

¹ On these substantives (and on the use of the infinitive absolute generally as absolute object, see above, *m*), cf. the *schema etymologicum* treated in connexion with the government of the verb in § 117 *p, q*.

² In Ez 7¹⁴ a perfect appears to be continued by means of an infinitive construct; but the text is quite corrupt; Cornill reads תִּקְעוּ תִּקְוֹעַ הָיָינוּ הָיָן.

absolute is most frequently used in this way, corresponding to the infinitive of command in Greek, &c.¹—

bb (a) For an emphatic imperative,² e. g. שָׁמֹר (thou shalt, ye shall), observe Dt 5¹²; זָכוֹר (thou shalt) remember, Ex 13³, 20⁸ (the full form occurs in Dt 6¹⁷ שָׁמֹר הַשְׁמָרָן; זָכוֹר הַזָּכוֹר 7¹⁸; Lv 2⁶, Nu 4², 25¹⁷, Dt 1¹⁶, 2 K 5¹⁰, Is 38⁵, Jer 2², followed by a *perfect consecutive*; Jos 1¹³, 2 K 3¹⁶, Is 7⁴, 14³¹ (parallel with an *imperative*; in Na 2² three imperatives follow). But הִיָּטָה פֶּשַׁע 142⁵ may be only an incorrect spelling of הִיָּטָה imperative.³

cc (β) For the jussive, Lv 6⁷, Nu 6⁵, 2 K 11¹⁵, Ez 23⁴⁶; cf. also Pr 17¹² (let it rather meet).

dd (γ) For the cohortative, Is 22^{13b} אֲבֹלֵי יִשְׁתּוּ (the exclamation of the mocker); Ez 21³¹, 23^{30,46}; perhaps also Jer 31² (הִלֹּךְ).⁴

ee (δ) For the imperfect in emphatic promises, e. g. 2 K 4⁴³ ye shall eat and leave thereof; 19²⁹ (Is 37³⁰), 2 Ch 31¹⁰; also in indignant questions, Jb 40² shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty? ⁵ (on the addition of the subject cf. the Rem. below); Jer 3¹ and thinkest thou to return again to me? Jer 7^{9ff}. (six infinitives, continued by means of the *perfect consecutive*; cf. § 112 o).

ff (ε) For any historical tense (like the Latin *historic infinitive*) in lively narration (or enumeration) and description, even of what is still taking place in present time, e. g. Hos 4² swearing and breaking faith, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery (in these they are busied); 10⁴ (after a *perfect*); Is 21⁵, 59⁴, Jer 8¹⁵, 14¹⁹, Jb 15³⁵; cf. further Jer 32³³, Ec 4².—In Ez 23³⁰, Pr 12⁷, 15²², and 25⁴, the infinitive absolute is best rendered by the passive.

¹ Cf. also such infinitives in French as *voir* (page so and so, &c.), *s'adresser* . . . , *se méfier des voleurs*!

² Prætorius, *op. cit.*, p. 547: the extraordinarily common use of the infinitive form *qātōl* in the sense of an imperative, jussive, or cohortative has long since caused it to be compared with the Arab. *fa'ālī*. It thus appears that the infin. *qātōl* in Hebrew could be used from early times as a kind of fixed, invariable word of command.

³ In Ez 21³¹, for the infinitives construct הָסִיר, הָרִים, הַשְׁפִּיל (beside הִנְבֵּה) read with Cornill the infinitives absolute הִסַּר, &c. The K^{ethibh} probably intends הִסִּיר, &c.

⁴ In 2 S 3¹⁸ the infinitive construct appears to be used instead of the cohortative, but הוֹשִׁיעַ should certainly be read for הוֹשִׁיעַ. Also in 1 K 22³⁰ (2 Ch 18²⁹), which was formerly included under this head (I will disguise myself and go into the battle), read אֶתְחַפֵּשׂ וְאָבֹא.

⁵ In Jb 34¹⁸ in a similar question instead of the infinitive constr. we should rather expect the infinitive absolute (הִאָּמַר), unless with the LXX and Vulg. the participle with the article (הַאֲמִיר) is to be read.

Rem. The subject is sometimes added to the infinitive absolute when it takes the place of the finite verb, e. g. Lv 6⁷, Nu 15³⁵, Dt 15², ψ 17⁵, Pr 17¹², Jb 40², Ec 4², Est 9¹. So, probably, also in Gn 17¹⁰, Ex 12⁴⁸, although here פִּלְיָוֹכֶר according to § 121 a might also be taken as an object with a passive verb; cf. Est 3¹³. In 1 S 25^{28,33} the subject follows an infinitive absolute which is co-ordinated with an infinitive construct, see above, e.

§ 114. The Infinitive Construct.

1. The infinitive construct, like the infinitive absolute, may also *a* represent a *nomen verbale* (§ 45 a), but of a much more flexible character than the infinitive absolute (cf. § 113 a). Its close relation with nouns properly so called is especially seen in the readiness with which the infinitive construct may be used for any case whatever; thus,

(a) As the nominative of the subject, e. g. Gn 2¹⁸ לֹא־טוֹב הָיִיתָ לְבַדְּךָ, literally, *not good is the being of man in his separation*; Gn 30¹⁵, 1 S 23²⁰, Is 7¹³, Pr 17²⁶, 25^{7,24} (but cf. 21⁹ לָשֹׁבֶת טוֹב in the same statement); ψ 32⁹ prop. *there is not a coming near unto thee*, but the text is probably corrupt. With a *feminine* predicate, 1 S 18²³, Jer 2¹⁷.

(b) As genitive, e. g. Ec 3⁴ עֵת סֹפֹר וְעֵת רִקּוֹד a *time of mourning* *b* and a *time of dancing*; Gn 2¹⁷, 29⁷, Neh 12⁴⁶, ■ Ch 24¹⁴. This equally includes, according to § 101 a, all those cases in which the infinitive construct depends on a preposition (see below, d) [and Driver, *Tenses*, § 206].

(c) As accusative of the object, e. g. 1 K 3⁷ לֹא אֵדַע צֵאת וְבֹא I *know c* *not the going out or the coming in* (*I know not how to go out and come in*); Gn 21⁶, 31²⁸, Nu 20²¹, Is 1¹⁴, 37²⁸ (even with אֵת), Jer 6¹⁵, Jb 15²² (cf. for the use of the infinitive absolute as object, § 113 f); as accusative with a verb expressing fullness, Is 11⁹.

2. The construction of the infinitive with prepositions (as in Greek, *d* εἰν τῷ εἶναι, δὲ τὸ εἶναι, &c.) may usually be resolved in English into the finite verb with a conjunction, e. g. Nu 35¹⁹ בְּפִגְעוֹ-בּוֹ in *his meeting him*, i. e. if (as soon as) he meets him; Gn 27⁴⁵ (עַד-שׁוֹב); Is 30¹² יֵצֵן כִּי־אֶסְקֶם because *ye despise*; Jer 2³⁵ עַל־אֲמַרְךָ because *thou sayest*; Gn 27¹ and *his eyes were dim* מִרְאֵת from *seeing*, i. e. so that he could not see.

This use of the infinitive construct is especially frequent in connexion with כִּי or עַד to express time-determinations (in English resolved into a temporal clause, as above the combination of the infinitive with יֵצֵן or עַל־ is resolved into a causal clause), especially after וַיְהִי (see the

examples, § 111 g), e.g. וַיְהִי כִּי רָאוּ אֶת-הַחֶמֶן when they were in Egypt; Gn 24³⁰ וַיִּבְשָׁמְעוּ וְ... וַיְהִי כִּי רָאָה אֶת-הַחֶמֶן and it came to pass, when he saw (prop. in the seeing) the ring ..., and when he heard (prop. in his hearing), &c.

f But by far the most frequent is the connexion of the infinitive construct with לְ.¹ Starting from the fundamental meaning of לְ, i. e. *direction towards something*, infinitives with לְ serve to express the most varied ideas of purpose or aim, and very commonly also (with a weakening or a complete disregard of the original meaning of the לְ) to introduce the object of an action, or finally even (like the infinitive absolute used adverbially, § 113 h, and the Latin gerund in -ndo) to state motives or attendant circumstances. See the instances in the Remarks.

g Rem. 1. The original meaning of the לְ is most plainly seen in those infinitives with לְ which expressly state a purpose (hence as the equivalent of a final clause), e.g. Gn 11⁵ and the Lord came down, לְרֹאֵת אֶת-הָעִיר to see the city; also with a change of subject, e.g. 2 S 12¹⁰ and thou hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite לְהִיּוֹת לָךְ לְאִשָּׁה to be (i. e. that she may be) thy wife; cf. Gn 28⁴, Jer 38²⁶ (לְמֹות).—If there is a special emphasis on the infinitive with לְ, it is placed, with its complement, before the governing verb, e.g. Gn 42⁹, 47⁴, Nu 22²⁰, Jos 2³, 1 S 16² with בָּוא; Ju 15¹⁰, 1 S 17²⁵ with עָלָה.

h 2. Just as clearly the idea of aiming at a definite purpose or turning towards an object may be seen in the combination of the verb הָיָה to be, with לְ and an infinitive. In fact הָיָה לַעֲשׂוֹת may mean, either (a) *he was in the act of, he was about to* (as it were, he set himself), *he was ready, to do something*, or (b) *he or it was appointed or compelled, &c., to do the action in question*. In the latter case הָיָה לַעֲשׂוֹת corresponds to the Latin *faciendum erat*, cf. also the English *I am to go*. In both cases הָיָה (as elsewhere when copula) is often omitted.

i Examples of (a) Gn 15¹² וַיְהִי הַשָּׁמֶשׁ לָבוֹא and when the sun was going down (just about to set); 2 Ch 26⁵ וַיְהִי לְדַרֵּשׁ אֱלֹהִים and he set himself to seek God (here with the secondary idea of a continuous action); with the omission of הָיָה Is 38²⁰ יְהוָה לְהוֹשִׁיעַנִי the Lord is ready to save me; 1 S 14²¹ (?), Jer 51⁴⁹, ψ 25¹⁴ (et foedus suum manifestaturus est eis); Pr 18²⁴ (?), 19⁸ לְמִצָּא consecuturus

¹ Cf. § 45 g, according to which the close union of the לְ with the first consonant of the infinitive (לְכַתֵּב with a firmly closed syllable, as opposed to כָּתַב, בְּכַתֵּב, &c.) seems to point to the formation of a special new verbal form. Quite distinct are the few examples where the infinitive with לְ serves to express time, as Gn 24⁶³ לְפָנוֹת עָרֵב at the eventide (prop. at the time of the return of evening); cf. Dt 23¹², Ex 14²⁷, Ju 19²⁶; 2 S 18²⁹ when Joab sent the king's servant.

est, unless we simply read יִמָּצֵא with the LXX)¹; 2c²⁵, Ec 3¹⁵ אֲשֶׁר לִהְיוֹת quod futurum est; 2 Ch 11²², 12¹² (in a negative statement); in a question, Est 7⁸ (will he even . . . ?). Cf. also 1 S 4¹⁹.

Of (b) Jos 2⁵ וַיְהִי הַשַּׁעַר לְסָגוֹר and the gate was to be shut (had to be shut); k Is 37²⁶, ψ 109¹⁸.² Mostly with the omission of הָיָה, e.g. 2 K 4¹³ מָה לַעֲשׂוֹת לְךָ וְג' what is to be done for thee? (הֵיטָב לְרִבְרָאֲךָ) wouldst thou be (lit. is it to be) spoken for to the king, &c.? 2 K 13¹⁹ לְהַכּוֹת it was to smite equivalent to thou shouldest have smitten; Is 5⁴, ψ 32⁹, 68¹⁹ (?), Jb 30⁶ (habitudinem est iis), 1 Ch 9²⁵, 10¹³, 22⁵, 2 Ch 8¹³ (?), 11²², 19², 36¹⁹ (?), Ho 9¹³, Hb 1¹⁷. In a question 2 Ch 19²; after לֹא 1 Ch 5¹, 15²; after אֵין 1 Ch 23²⁶, 2 Ch 5¹¹ and frequently.

Of the same kind also are the cases, in which the infinitive with ל depends on the idea of an obligation or permission (or prohibition); especially in such forms of expression as 2 S 18¹¹ עָלַי לָתֶת לְךָ וְג' it was upon me, i. e. it would have been my duty to give thee, &c.³; cf. Mi 3¹ (2 Ch 13⁵) it is not for you to (i. e. are ye not bound to)?⁴ with a negative, 2 Ch 26¹⁸ לֹא לְךָ וְג' it pertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but only to the priests; also אֵין ל with an infinitive expresses it is not permitted (nefas est), may not, e.g. Est 4² לֹא לָבוֹא for none might enter; 8⁸, 1 Ch 15²; אֵין ל with an infinitive is used in a somewhat different sense, equivalent to it is not feasible, not possible, e.g. in ψ 40⁶, Ec 3¹⁴, 2 Ch 5¹¹.⁶—With either meaning לֹא can be used instead of אֵין, e.g. Am 6¹⁰ לֹא לְהִזְכִּיר nefas est, to make mention of the name of the Lord: but Ju 1¹⁹ for it was not possible to drive out, &c., perhaps, however, the text originally stood as in Jos 17¹² לֹא יִכְלֹו לָהּ; 1 Ch 15².

¹ P. Haupt (SBOT., Proverbs, p. 52, lines 10 ff.; Critical Notes on Esther, p. 17c, on 7⁸) considers it possible that here and in Pr 2⁵, 6²⁴, 7⁵, 16³⁰, 30¹⁴, as well as in 14³⁵, 17²¹ before a noun, the ל is a survival of the emphatic ל with an imperf., which is especially common in Arabic. In that case לִמָּצֵא must be read לִמָּצֵא, i. e. ל + יִמָּצֵא. But all the above instances can be taken as infinitives with ל without difficulty.

² Somewhat different are the cases where הָיָה ל with the infinitive (which is then used exactly as a substantive) implies to become something, i. e. to meet with a particular fate, as Nu 24²² (cf. Is 5⁵, 6¹³) לְבַעַר for wasting, for which elsewhere frequently לְשַׂמָּה and the like; probably also לְבָלוֹת ψ 49¹⁵ is to be explained in this way, the הָיָה being omitted.

³ 2 S 4¹⁰ (cui dandum erat mihi) appears to be similar; it may, however, be better, with Wellhausen, to omit the אֲשֶׁר.

⁴ But in 1 S 23²⁰ after וְלָנוּ and our part shall be the infinitive without ל stands as the subject of the sentence.

⁵ Quite different of course are such cases as Is 37³ וְכֵחַ אֵין לְלָרֶה and there is not strength to bring forth; cf. Nu 20⁵, Ru 4⁴.

⁶ In 2 S 14¹⁹ אִישׁ (= יֵשׁ it is, there is) is used in a similar sense after אִם, the negative particle of asseveration, of a truth it is not possible to turn to the right hand or to the left.

m 3. A further class comprises the very numerous cases, in which the infinitive with לְ is used as the object¹ of a governing verb, hence, again, for the direction which an action takes. The verbs (or conjugations) which occur most frequently in this combination with לְ and an infinitive are: הָחֵל (with an infinitive without לְ, e.g. Dt 25³¹, Jos 3⁷), הוֹסִיף, הוֹסִיף, יָסַף (prop. to add) to continue, very frequently, even in prose, with an infinitive without לְ, as Gn 4¹², 8^{10.12}, 37⁵, 1 S 3⁸, Jb 27¹, &c.; חָרַל to cease from, to desist; כָּלַה to complete, to make an end of; הֵמָּס to be finished; הִקְרִיב to come near to, Gn 12¹¹; מָהֵר to hasten (with an infinitive without לְ Ex 2¹⁸); אָבָה to be willing (with an infinitive without לְ Is 28¹², 30⁹, Jb 39⁹); חָפֵץ to will, to desire; מָאֵן to refuse (to be unwilling); בִּקֵּשׁ to seek; יָכַל to be able (with an infinitive without לְ, e.g. Gn 24⁵⁰, 37⁴, Ex 2³, 18²³, Nu 22³⁸, Jb 4²); נָתַן with an accusative of the person in the sense of to give up to some one, to cause, or permit him to do something, e.g. Gn 20⁶, ψ 16¹¹ (with an infinitive abs. Jb 9¹⁸, see § 113 d), יָדַע to understand how to do something (in Jb 3⁸ הָעֵתִידִים עָרַר is analogous); לָמַד to learn; קָהָה to wait, expect (with a change of subject, e.g. Is 5² and he waited for it to bring forth grapes).

n We must further mention here a number of verbs in Hiph'il (partly denominatives), which express an action in some definite direction (cf. § 53 f), as הִגְדִּיל to do greatly, הִשְׁפִּיל to make (it) low, הִנְבִּיֵּה to make (it) high, הִעֲמִיק to make (it) deep, הִרְחִיק to make (it) far, distant, הִיטִיב to make (it) good (with an infinitive without לְ ψ 33³, but 1 S 16¹⁷, in the same combination, with לְ); הִשְׁקִים to do anything early (ψ 127², along with its opposite אָחַר to do something late, with an infinitive without לְ); הִרְבֶּה to make (it) much, הִפְלִא to make (it) wonderful (even with a passive infinitive 2 Ch 26¹⁵),² &c.

¹ This view is based upon the fact, that in numerous expressions of this kind (see the examples above) the לְ may be omitted, and the infinitive consequently stand as an actual accusative of the object (see above, c). However, the connexion of the verb with the object is in the latter case closer and more emphatic (hence especially adapted to poetic or prophetic diction), than the looser addition of the infinitive with לְ; thus לֹא אָבוּ שְׁמוֹעַ Is 28¹² is equivalent to they desired not obeying (לֹא אָבוּ also with the infin. abs. in Is 42²⁴; cf. § 113 d); but לֹא אָבוּ לְשָׁמַע Ez 20⁸ rather expresses they could not make up their mind as to hearkening. When connected with לְ, the governing verb has a more independent sense than when it directly governs the accusative of the object.

² In almost all these examples the principal idea is properly contained in the infinitive, whilst the governing verb strictly speaking contains only a subordinate adverbial statement, and is therefore best rendered in English by an adverb; e.g. Gn 27²⁰ how is it that thou hast found it so quickly? (prop. how thou hast hastened to find!), Gn 31²⁷ wherefore didst thou flee secretly? So frequently with הִרְבֶּה (=often, abundantly), Ex 36⁵, 1 S 1¹², 2 K 21⁶, Is 55⁷, Am 4⁴, ψ 78³³, &c.; with נָשׁוּב (=again), Dt 30⁹, 1 K 13¹⁷, Ho 11⁹, Ezr 9¹⁴; cf. also 2 S 19⁴, Jer 1¹², Jn 4², and the analogous instances in § 120 g; also 2 K 2¹ thou hast asked a hard thing.

4. Finally, the infinitive with **ל** is very frequently used in a much looser *O* connexion to state motives, attendant circumstances, or otherwise to define more exactly. In English, such infinitive constructions (like the Latin gerund in *-do*; cf. *f*) must frequently be turned by *that* or a gerund; e.g. 1 S 12¹⁷ **לְשַׁאֵל לְךָ מֶלֶךְ** *in asking you a king*; 14³⁸, 19⁵, 20³⁶, Gn 3²², 18¹⁹, 34^{7,15}, Ex 23², Lv 5^{4,22,26}, 8¹⁵, Nu 14³⁶, 2 S 3¹⁰, 1 K 2³¹, 14⁸, Jer 44⁷, ψ 63³, 78¹⁸, 101⁸, 103²⁰, 104¹⁴, 111⁶, Pr 2⁸, 8³⁴, 18⁵, Neh 13¹⁸. Sometimes the infinitive with **ל** is used in this way simply by itself, e.g. 1 Ch 12⁸ *as the roes upon the mountains* **לְמַהֵר** (as regards hasting) *in swiftness*; Gn 2³, 2 S 14²⁵ (**לְהָלֵל**); Is 21¹ (**לְחַלּוֹף**); Jo 2²⁶, Pr 2², 26² and so very frequently the infinitive **לְאמֹר** *dicendo* which has become stereotyped as an adverb to introduce direct narration (in the sense of *thus, as follows*).¹

5. In a number of instances—especially in the later books—the infin. *P* constr. with **ל** appears to be attached by *Wāw* (like the infinitive absolute, § 113 *e*), as the continuation of a previous finite verb. In most examples of this kind it is, however, evident that the infinitive with **ל** virtually depends on an idea of intention, effort, or being in the act of, which, according to the sense, is contained in what has preceded, whilst the copula, as sometimes also elsewhere, is used in an emphatic sense (*and that too*); thus e.g. Ex 32²⁹ (if the text be right) *fill your hand to-day* (sc. with an offering) *for the Lord . . . and that to bring a blessing upon you*, i.e. that ye may be blessed; cf. 1 S 25³¹ (otherwise in verses 26 and 33 where the infinitive absolute is used, see § 113 *e*); ψ 104²¹, 2 Jb 34⁸, Ec 9¹, Neh 8¹³, 2 Ch 7¹⁷.—In Lv 10¹⁰ **וְלִהְיוֹל** might be regarded as an explanatory addition to the command contained in verse 9 *b* (=this prohibition of wine before the service shall ye observe, and that in order to put a difference, &c.); but probably the text has been disturbed by a redactor.—In 2 Ch 30⁹ **וְלִשְׁבֹּחַ** depends on the idea of receiving a favour which lies in **לְרַחֲמֵם**. On the other hand, in 1 S 8¹² it is sufficient to explain *and in order to appoint them unto him for captains of thousands* (sc. he will take them). In Is 44²⁸ translate *and he (Cyrus) shall perform all my pleasure, and that in saying of Jerusalem, &c.*

3. The period of time to which an action or occurrence represented *Q* by the infinitive construct belongs, must sometimes be inferred from the context, or from the character of the principal tenses; cf. e.g. Gn 2⁴ *these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth*, **בְּהִבְרָאם** *when they were created* (prop. in their being created); Ju 6¹⁸ **עַד-בֹּאִי וְנ'** *until*

¹ **לְאמֹר** is very often so used after **וַיִּדְבֹּר** in the Priestly document (Gn 8¹⁵, 17³, &c., and numberless times in the legal parts of Exod., Lev., and Num.)—a pleonasm which is not surprising considering the admittedly prolix and formal style of the document.

² When Delitzsch on ψ 104²¹, referring to Hb 1¹⁷, explains the infinitive with **ל** as an elliptical mode of expressing the *coniugatio periphrastica* (equivalent to *flagitaturi sunt a deo cibum suum*), this is, in point of fact, certainly applicable to this and a few other places mentioned above; but all these passages, in which the infinitive with **וְ** follows, are to be distinguished from the cases treated above under *h*, where the infinitive with **ל** without *Wāw* corresponds to a Latin gerundive, or is actually used to express the *coniugatio periphrastica*.

I come unto thee, and bring forth, &c. Cf. 1 S 18¹⁹ (= *when she should have been given*); 2 K 2¹, Ho 7¹.

7 Rem. 1. The constructions of the infinitive with a preposition, described above under *d*, are almost always continued in the further course of the narrative by means of the *finite verb*, i. e. by an independent sentence, not by a co-ordinate infinitive. Such a finite verb *we* regard as governed by a conjunction, which corresponds to the preposition standing before the infinitive. Thus the infinitival construction (frequently even with a change of subject) is continued by a perfect (with לָ), Jer 9¹² *because they have forsaken* (עַל־עֲוֹנֵיהֶם) *my law . . .* וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ and *have not obeyed my voice*; Gn 39¹⁰, 1 S 24¹², Am 1⁹; without לָ Jb 28²⁵ (perf. after לְ and infin.); by a perfect with וְ (cf. § 112 i and v) Am 1¹¹ עַל־הָרָפוּ וְ because *he did pursue his brother with the sword, and did cast off continually all pity* (a frequentative perfect; for examples of the perfect consecutive proper see Gn 27⁴⁵, Ju 6¹⁸, 1 S 10⁸, 2 K 18³² [Is 36¹⁷], always after עַד־בָּאִי until *I come*); by a simple imperfect, e. g. Pr 1²⁷ (after בְּ); Is 30²⁶ (after בַּיּוֹם in the day, a temporal phrase which has here become equivalent to a preposition); Is 5²⁴ (after בְּ), 10², 13⁹, 14²⁵, 45¹, 49⁵, 1 S 2⁸, Pr 2⁸, 5², 8²¹ (always after לְ) ¹; by an imperfect consecutive, e. g. Gn 39¹⁸ and *it came to pass*, וַיִּקְרָא קוֹלִי וַאֲקֵרָא as *I lifted up my voice and cried, that . . .*; 1 K 10⁹, Jb 38¹³ (after לְ); 1 K 18¹⁸, Is 38⁹, Jb 38^{7,9} ff. (after בְּ); Is 30¹², Jer 7¹³, Ez 34⁸ (after עָנָה).

8 2. The negation of an infinitive construct, on account of the predominance of the noun-element in its character, is effected not by the verbal negative לֹא (except in the compound בְּלֹא, which has come to be used as a preposition, *without*, Nu 35²³, Pr 15²), but by בְּלֹאִי, originally a substantive (see the Lexicon), with לְ prefixed (but also Nu 14¹⁶ מִבְּלֹאִי, e. g. Gn 31¹¹ אֲכַל־מִמֶּנּוּ לְבְּלֹאִי *not to eat of it*; in a final sense, 4¹⁵ *lest any finding him should smite him*; only in 2 K 23¹⁰ is לְ repeated before the infinitive. In ψ 32⁹ (if the text be right) בְּלֹא negatives, not the infinitive, but the predicate which is understood.

§ 115. Construction of the Infinitive Construct with Subject and Object.

α 1. Like the infinitive absolute (see § 113 α), the character of the infinitive construct as a *verbal noun* is shown by its power of taking the case proper to its verb, and hence in transitive verbs ² *the accusative of the object*, e. g. Nu 9¹⁵ אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא *on the day the*

¹ The great frequency of examples of this kind, especially in the poetical books, is due to a striving after what is called *chiasmus* in the arrangement of the parallel members in the two halves of the verse, i. e. in the instances given, the finite verb *at the end* of the second (co-ordinate) clause is parallel with the infinitive *at the beginning* of the first. In this way the verbal form necessarily became separated from the לְ, and consequently the imperfect had to be used instead of the perfect consecutive. Such a parallelism of the *external and internal* members of a verse is frequent also in other cases, and was evidently felt to be an elegance of elevated—poetic or prophetic—style.

² For examples of the accus. of the object with a pass. infin., see § 121 c.

tabernacle was reared up; 1 S 19¹ אֶת־דָּוִד לְהָמִית *that they should slay David*; Gn 14¹⁷, 19²⁹, Ex 38²⁷, 1 K 12¹⁵, 15⁴; with a negative, e.g. Lv 26¹⁵ לֹבְלֹתִי עֲשׂוֹת אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתַי *so that ye will not do all my commandments*; with the accusative of the personal pronoun, e.g. Dt 29¹² לִמְעַן לְהָקִים אֹתָךְ *that he may establish thee*; Gn 25²⁶, Jer 24⁷; with a verbal suffix, e.g. Ex 2¹⁴ לְהַרְגֵנִי *to kill me*; Jer 38²⁶ לִבְלֹתִי הִשְׁיִבֵנִי *that he would not cause me to return* (on the suffix, cf. c). In Is 49⁶ the object even precedes the infinitive with ל; on this order cf. the note on § 114 r.—If the verb governs a double accusative, the infinitive may also take the same, e.g. Gn 41³⁹ אֶת־כָּל־זֹאת הוֹרִיעַ אֱלֹהִים אֵתְךָ *forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this*; Dt 21¹⁶.

Rem. 1. The object after the infinitive construct must also always be *b* regarded as in the accusative, even when it is not expressly introduced (as in all the above examples) by the *nota accusativi* אֶת, and when therefore the substantive in question might easily be taken as the *genitive of the object* governed by the infinitive (the usual construction in Arabic), e.g. Pr 21¹⁵ עֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט *to do judgement*. Against regarding it as a genitive, which is in itself possible (*the doing, the executing of judgement*), is the fact (a) that elsewhere the *nota accusativi* is so frequently added; (b) that in such a case the secondary forms of the infinitive, such as רָאָה for רָאָת (פָּנִיךְ) Gn 48¹¹ (cf. ψ 101³, Pr 16¹⁶), would be unintelligible; (c) that certain infinitive forms, if they were to be regarded as in the construct state, could hardly retain the pretonic Qames without exception, whereas, when connected with suffixes (i.e. with real genitives; cf. § 33 c), this Qames necessarily becomes Šewā; e.g. Gn 18²⁵ לְהָמִית צְדִיק *to slay the righteous* (never as לָהֵמִית; cf., on the other hand, above, הִשְׁיִבֵנִי; 2 K 21⁸, Ez 44³⁰). Similarly in such cases as Is 3¹³ (ψ 50⁴) instead of לָרִין עַמִּים we should rather expect לָרִין, if the infinitive were regarded as in the construct state, and עַמִּים as the genitive. Hence also in cases like Is 58⁹ (שָׁלַח for שָׁלַח) we must assume, with Sellin, op. cit., p. 78, a merely 'external phonetic connexion' and not the genitive construction.

2. The verbal suffixes added to the infinitive are (with the exception of *C* לְהוֹצִיאָהוּ Jer 39¹⁴) only the suffix of the 1st pers. sing. (besides the above examples cf. also 1 S 5¹⁰, 27¹, 28⁹, Ru 2¹⁰, 1 Ch 12¹⁷, &c.) and plural; e.g. לְהַשְׁמִידֵנִי *to destroy us*, Dt 1²⁷ (immediately after לָתֵת אֹתָנוּ, so that נִגְ is doubtless a verbal not a noun-suffix, although in form it might be either); לְהַמְיִתָּנוּ Nu 16¹³, Ju 13²³ (after חָפֵץ). Elsewhere the pronominal object is appended either by means of the accusative sign (e.g. Gn 25²⁶ אֹתָם בָּלָדָת *prop. in the bearing them*; לָרַעַת אֹתִי *to know me*, Jer 24⁷) or in the form of a noun-suffix (as genitive of the object). The latter occurs almost always, whenever the context excludes the possibility of a misunderstanding; e.g. 1 S 20³³ לְהַכְתּוֹ (prop. for his smiting) *to smite him*, not, as the form might also mean, *in order that he might smite*; cf. 1 K 20³⁵; with the suffix of the 3rd sing. fem. Nu 22²⁵; of the 3rd plur. Jos 10²⁰, 2 S 21², &c. Hence also the suffixes of the 2nd sing. with the infinitive, as לְהַכְתֶּךָ Jer 40¹⁴, cf. Mi 6¹³, and even נִבְּלֶךָ *to magnify thee*, Jos 3⁷, must certainly be regarded as *nominal* not *verbal* suffixes. The connexion of the noun-suffix, as genitive of the object, with the infinitive,

was so fully established, that it could be used not only in such strange cases, as Gn 37⁴ **לֹא יִכְלֹוּ דַבְּרוֹ לְשָׁלֹם** *they could not speak to him peaceably*, cf. Zc 3¹ **לְשֹׁטְנוֹ** *to be an adversary to him*, but ultimately even in the 1st sing., as in Nu 22¹³ **לְתַתִּי** *to give me leave* [Dt 25⁷ **לֹא אֵבֶה יָבִי עִצְבִּי** *he will not perform the duty of a husband's brother unto me*; 1 Ch 4¹⁰ **לְבַלְתִּי עֲצָבִי** *that it may not grieve me!*]

d 3. The power of governing like a verb is also retained in those verbal nouns which, although originally secondary forms of the infinitive, have fully acquired the value of nouns, e. g. Is 11⁹ **דַּעַת אֲתִיהוֹה** (prop. to know the Lord) *the knowledge of the Lord*; **לִירָאָה אֹתִי** *to fear me*, Dt 4¹⁰, 5²⁶, 10¹²; an accusative follows **לְהַנְבִּיחַ** Dt 10^{12,15}, Is 56⁶ (cf. also 1 K 10⁹, Ho 3¹); **לְהַנְבִּיחַ** Is 30²⁸; **בְּשִׁנְאָת יְהוָה אֲתָנִי** Dt 1²⁷; after verbal nouns formed with the prefix **מ** (cf. § 45 e), Nu 10², Is 13¹⁹, Am 4¹¹, Ez 17⁹. The accusative of the object likewise remains after infinitives (or their secondary forms) which have the article, e. g. Gn 2⁹, Jer 22¹⁶, or a suffix, e. g. Gn 5⁴, &c., 28^{4,6}, 29^{19 f}, 30¹⁵, 38⁵, 2 S 3¹¹, Is 29¹³.

e 2. The subject of the action represented by the infinitive is mostly placed immediately¹ after it, either in the *genitive* or *nominative*. The subject is in the genitive (§ 33 c) whenever it has the form of a noun-suffix, and also when the infinitive has the termination of the constr. st. fem. sing. (see f); probably also in many other cases, where the infinitive in form and meaning is used more like a substantive, and accordingly governs like a noun. On the other hand, the subject of the infinitive is certainly to be regarded as a nominative, when it is separated from the infinitive by any insertion, and according to certain indications (see g) very probably in many other instances.

f Rem. 1. Examples of genitives of the subject after infinitives in the connective form are Dt 1²⁷ **בְּשִׁנְאָת יְהוָה אֲתָנִי** prop. *in the Lord's hating us*; cf. 7⁸, Gn 19¹⁶, 1 K 10⁹, Is 13¹⁹, 47⁹, Ho 3¹, Am 4¹¹. The subject of the infinitive is probably also to be regarded as genitive in such cases as Ex 17¹ *and there was no water* **לְשִׁתֵּת הָעָם** *for the people to drink* (prop. for the drinking of the people), and in cases like Gn 16¹⁶ (**בְּלִלְתֵּת הָנֶרֶךְ**); Gn 16³, Ex 19¹, Nu 20^{3,4}, 33³⁸, 1 K 6¹, ψ 133¹, 2 Ch 7³, &c.

g 2. Examples in which the subject is separated from the infinitive by an insertion, and hence must certainly be regarded as a nominative, are Jb 34²² **לְהַפְתֵּר שָׁם פְּעֻלֵּי אֹן** *that the workers of iniquity may hide themselves there* (prop. for the hiding themselves there the workers of iniquity); cf. Gn 34¹⁵, Nu 35⁶, Dt 19³, Ju 9², 2 S 24¹³, ψ 76¹⁰, and below, i. The subject is likewise to be regarded as a *nominative*, whenever the *Lamedh* is prefixed to the infinitive by means of a pretonic Qames (cf. b above), e. g. 2 S 19²⁰ **לְשׁוֹם הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל־לְבֹ**

¹ In Gn 24³⁰ the subject of **כְּרָאָה** is wanting (but **כְּשִׁמְעֹו** follows); the original reading was undoubtedly **כְּרָאָהּ**, and the text is now in a state of confusion; verse 30a should come before verse 29b. In Gn 19²⁹, 25²⁶, Ex 9¹⁶, 13²¹, 1 S 18¹⁹, Jer 41⁶, ψ 42⁴ the subject, although not indicated, is easily supplied from the context. The infinitive in such cases is best rendered in English by a passive.

since, if the infinitive were used as a *nomen regens*, we should rather expect לְשׁוֹם according to § 102 *f*. That the subject of the infinitive is regarded elsewhere also as nominative is again (see above, *b*) probable, since in such forms as הָנִיחַ Dt 25¹⁹, Is 14³, הָמִיר ψ 46³, &c., the pretonic Qames is retained without exception, whereas on the analogy of הָנִיחַ Ez 24¹³, הָקִימוֹ Jer 23²⁰, &c., we should expect הָנִיחַ, הָמִיר, &c., if the infinitive were regarded as a *nomen regens*. Or was the retention of the Qames (assuming the thorough correctness of the Masoretic punctuation) rendered possible even before a following genitive, because that vowel was characteristic of the form? It is at all events certain that owing to the lack of case-endings,¹ a distinction between the genitival and nominative constructions could not have been consciously made in the case of most infinitives, e.g. in unchangeable forms like קָטַל, קוּם, &c.

3. When both a *subject* and an *object* are connected with the *infinitive*, the rule is, that the subject should immediately follow the infinitive, and then the object. The latter, in such a case, is necessarily in the accusative, but the subject (as in *e*) may be either in the genitive or in the nominative. The noun-suffixes again are, of course, to be regarded as genitives, e.g. Gn 39¹⁸ בְּהִרְיָמִי קוּלִי as *I lifted up my voice* (cf. 1 K 13²¹, and the examples, Gn 5⁴, &c., enumerated above, under *d*), and so also substantives which follow a connective form, Dt 1²⁷, &c.; see above, *d* and *f*.

On the other hand, the subject appears necessarily to be in the *nominative* in such cases as Is 10¹⁵ בְּהִנִּיף שֵׁבֶט אֶת־מִרְיָמִי as *if a rod should shake them that lift it up* (for the plur. מִרְיָמִי cf. § 124 *k*), not בְּהִנִּיף, as would be expected (see *g* above), if שֵׁבֶט were in the genitive; cf. 2 S 14¹³, Jb 33¹⁷. And so probably also in other cases, as Gn 5¹, 13¹⁰, Jos 14⁷, 1 K 13⁴, 2 K 23¹⁰, Is 32⁷. The subject is separated from the infinitive by an insertion (and consequently must necessarily be in the nominative; see *g* above), e.g. in Jer 21¹.

Rem. Less frequently the object is placed immediately after the infinitive, *k* and then the nominative of the subject, as a subsequent complement, e.g. Is 20¹ כָּרְגוּן אֵתוֹ בְּשִׁלְחָה when *Sargon sent him*; Gn 4¹⁵, Jos 14¹¹, 2 S 18²⁹, Is 5²⁴, ψ 56¹, Pr 25⁸. In Nu 24²³ the subject follows an infinitive which has a noun-suffix in place of the object.

§ 116. *The Participles.*

Cf. Sellin (see above at the head of § 113), p. 6 ff., and Kahan, p. 11 ff.

1. Like the two infinitives, the participles also occupy a middle *a* place between the noun and the verb. In form they are simple nouns,

¹ In Arabic, where the case-endings leave no doubt as to the construction, it is equally possible to say either *qatlu Zaidin* (gen. of subj.) '*Amran* (acc.), literally *Zaid's killing 'Amr*, or *qatlu 'Amrin* (gen. of obj.) *Zaidun* (nom. of subj.), or even *el-qatlu* (with article) *Zaidun* (nom. of subj.) '*Amran* (acc. of obj.).

and most nearly related to the adjective; consequently they cannot in themselves be employed to represent definite relations of tense or mood. On the other hand, their verbal character is shown by their not representing, like the adjectives, a fixed and permanent quality (or state), but one which is in some way connected with an *action* or *activity*. The *participle active* indicates a person or thing conceived as being in the continual uninterrupted *exercise* of an activity. The *participle passive*, on the other hand, indicates the person or thing in a state which has been brought about by external *actions*.

b Rem. That the language was fully conscious of the difference between a state implying action (or effected by external action) and mere passivity, is seen from the fact, that participles proper cannot be formed from the purely stative Qal, but only verbal adjectives of the form *qāṭel* (מָלֵא, &c.) or *qāṭōl* (נָבַח, &c.), whereas the *transitive* Qal שָׂנֵא *to hate*, although it coincides in form with the intransitive Qal (as a verb middle *e*), nevertheless forms a participle active שֹׂנֵא, and participle passive שְׁנוּא (cf. the feminine שְׁנוּאָה).—In cases where the participle proper and the verbal adjective both occur, they are by no means synonymous. When the Assyrians are called in Is 28¹¹ לְעִי שִׁפְהָ *men of stammering lips*, a character is ascribed to them which is inseparably connected with their personality. On the other hand בָּלָה לְעֵינַי Jer 20⁷, describes those about the prophet as continually engaged in casting ridicule upon him. Cf. also ψ 9¹⁸ (שִׁבְחִי) with 50²² (שִׁבְחִי).

c On the difference between the participle as expressing *simple* duration and the imperfect as expressing *progressive* duration, cf. what has been stated above in § 107 *d*. Nevertheless the participle is sometimes used—especially in the later books, cf. e.g. Neh 6¹⁷, 2 Ch 17¹¹—where we should expect the action to be divided up into its several parts, and consequently should expect the finite verb. But the substitution of the participle for the *tempus historicum*, which becomes customary in Aramaic (cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, § 76. 2, *d* and *e*), is nevertheless quite foreign to Hebrew.

d 2. The period of time indicated by (*a*) a participle active, either as an attribute or predicate, must be inferred from the particular context. Thus מֵת may mean either *moriens* (Zc 11⁹), or *mortuus* (so commonly; with the article הַמֵּת regularly=*the dead man*), or *moriturus* (Dt 4²²); בָּא *coming, come* Gn 18¹¹, &c., *venturus* 1 S 2³¹, &c.; נָפַל *falling*, but also *fallen*, Ju 3²⁵, 1 S 5³, and *ready to fall* (threatening ruin, Is 30¹³, Am 9¹¹). For other examples of perfect participles see Gn 27³³, 43¹⁸ (הָשִׁב *that was returned*; cf. Ezr 6²¹, &c., הָשָׁבִים *which were come again* from the captivity); Gn 35³, Ex 11⁵, Zc 12¹, ψ 137⁷, Pr 8⁹, Jb 12⁴ (קָרָא), and see *m* below. For future participles see Gn 41²⁵, 1 K 18⁹, Is 5⁵, Jon 1³, &c., probably also לָקְחִי Gn 19¹⁴. On the *futurum instans* (esp. after הֵינֵה) see *p* below.

e (*b*) Of the passive participles, that of Qal (e.g. כְּתוּב *scriptus*) always corresponds to a Latin or Greek perfect participle passive, those of the other conjugations, especially *Niph'al*, sometimes to

a Latin gerundive (or to an adjective in *-bilis*), e. g. נֹרָא *metuendus*, to be feared, ψ 76⁸, &c.; נִחְמָר *desiderandus* (*desiderabilis*) Gn 3⁶, ψ 19¹¹, &c.; נִבְרָא *creandus* ψ 102¹⁹; נוֹלָךְ, usually *natus*, but also (like הַיּוֹלֵךְ Ju 13⁸) *procreandus, nasciturus* 1 K 13², ψ 22³²; נִעְרָץ *terribilis* ψ 89⁸; נִתְעַב *abominable* Jb 15¹⁶; נִחְשָׁב *aestimandus* Is 2²²; רִבְנָאֲכָלָת *that may be eaten* (an animal) Lv 11⁴⁷. In *Pu'al* מְהֻלָּל *laudandus, worthy to be praised* ψ 18⁴. In *Hoph'al*, 2 S 20²¹ מְשֻׁלָּף; 2 K 11² הַמּוֹמְתִים; Is 12⁵ מִזֵּדֵעַת Qerê.¹

3. The participles active, in virtue of their partly verbal character, *f* possess the power of governing like verbs, and consequently, when used in the absolute state, may take after them an object either in the accusative, or with the preposition with which the verb in question is elsewhere usually construed, e. g. 1 S 18²⁹ אֹיֵב אֶת־דָּוִד *hating David*; Gn 42²⁹; with the suffix of the accusative, e. g. עָשִׂנִי *that made me* Jb 31¹⁵; רָאִינוּ מִי רָאִינוּ *who seeth us?* Is 29¹⁵ (in Is 47¹⁰ רָאִנִי is abnormal); רָדִים *ruling them* ψ 68²⁸, sometimes also with the article, e. g. ψ 18³³ הַמֵּאֲרִי *that girdeth me* (LXX ὁ καταϊών με); Dt 8¹⁴⁻¹⁶, 13^{6,11}, 20¹, 2 S 1²⁴, Is 9¹² (where, however, Cheyne omits the article), 63¹¹, ψ 81¹¹, 103⁴, Dn 11⁶; followed by a preposition, e. g. 1 K 9²⁸ הָרִדִים בָּעָם *which bare rule over the people*; ■ K 20⁵ לֵךְ הִנְנִי רֹפֵא לָךְ *behold, I will heal thee*.²

By an exhaustive examination of the statistics, Sellin (see the title at the head of § 113), p. 40 ff., shows that the participle when construed as a *verb* expresses a single and comparatively transitory act, or relates to particular cases, historical facts, and the like, while the participle construed as a *noun* (see *g*) indicates repeated, enduring, or commonly occurring acts, occupations, and thoughts.

So also the verbal adjectives of the form *qāṭel* may take an accusative of the person or thing, if the finite verb from which they are derived governs an accusative, e. g. Dt 34⁹ רֵיחַ חֲכָמָה מְלֵא *full of the spirit of wisdom*; ψ 5⁵ חָפֵץ רֵשָׁע *that hath pleasure in wickedness*.

As a sort of noun the participle may, however, also exercise the *g* same government as a noun, being in the construct state, and followed by the object of the action in the genitive (see § 89 *a*; and cf. § 128 *x*), e. g. ψ 5¹² אֲהַבִּי שְׁמֶךָ *that love thy name*; cf. ψ 19⁸⁴; also when a verbal adjective, e. g. Gn 22¹² and often יִרָא אֱלֹהִים *one fearing*

¹ Such examples as נֹרָא, נִחְמָר, מְהֻלָּל show plainly the origin of this gerundive use of the participle passive. A person or thing *feared, desired, or praised* at all times is shown thereby to be *terrible, desirable, or praiseworthy*, and therefore also *to be feared, &c.*

² On the other hand, in Is. 11⁹ *as the waters* לִים מְכַסִּים *covering the sea*, the ל serves only to introduce the object preceding the participle [cf. the Arabic parallels cited by Driver, *Tenses*, § 135, 7 Obs.]. Cf. Hab. 2¹⁴.

God; Hb 2¹⁵; with an infinitive, ψ 127²; with a noun-suffix (which, according to § 33 c, also represents a genitive), e. g. Gn 4¹⁴ בְּלִמְצֹאִי *whosoever findeth me* (prop. my finder; cf. עֹשֵׂי my maker); 12³ מְבַרְכֶּיךָ *that bless thee*, מְקַלְלֶיךָ *that curseth thee* (but read either מְקַלְלֶיךָ, or מְבַרְכֶּיךָ in the preceding clause); 27²⁹, 1 S 2³⁰, Is 63¹³, ψ 18⁴⁹. In Jer 33²² read מְשֻׁרְתִּים אֲתִי.¹

7. Rem. To the class of objective genitives belong also specifications of place after the participles בָּא *iniens* and יֵצֵא *egrediens*, since the verbs בּוֹא and יֵצֵא, in the sense of *ingredi*, *egredi*, can be directly connected with an accusative; e. g. Gn 23^{10.18} בָּאִי שָׁעַר עִירוֹ *that went in at the gate of his city*; La 1⁴; after יֵצֵאִי Gn 9¹⁰, 34²⁴, 46²⁶, &c.—In poetic language the participle in the construct state may be connected not only with a genitive of the object, but also with any other specifications (especially of space) which otherwise can only be made to depend on the verb in question by means of a preposition; cf. Is 38¹⁸, and frequently, יוֹרְדֵי-יָבוֹר *they that go down into the pit* (the grave); ψ 88⁶ שְׁכְבֵי קֶבֶר *that lie in the grave*; Dt 32²⁴ (Mi 7¹⁷); 1 K 2⁷, 2 K 11^{5.7.9} *those that came in* (or went out) on the sabbath, Pr 2⁷, 1 Ch 5¹⁸, &c.; instead of the construction with מִן, e. g. Is 59²⁰ (those who turn from transgression), Mi 2⁸.

2. These genitives of nearer definition appear also in the form of a noun-suffix, e. g. ψ 18^{40.49} קָמִי (קָמִים עָלַי) *that rise up against me*; cf. Ex 15⁷, Dt 33¹¹, ψ 44⁶, Ex 32²⁵, Is 1²⁷ שׁוֹבֶיהָ *her converts*; ψ 53⁶ (חֲנֹךְ); Pr 2¹⁹ כָּל-בָּאֶיהָ *all that go unto her*; the construction is especially bold in Is 29⁷ כָּל-צָבִיהָ וּמִצְרֹתָהָ *all that fight against her and her stronghold* (for כָּל-הַצָּבָאִים עָלֶיהָ וְעַל-מִ' ψ 102⁹ even with a participle Po'al, מְהוֹלְלִי *they that are mad against me* (?), but read perhaps with Olshausen מְהוֹלְלִי *who pierce me*.—In Is 1³⁰ as a terebinth עֹלֶה נֹבֵלֶת *fading as regards its leaf*, it remains doubtful whether נֹבֵלֶת is in the absolute state, and consequently עֹלֶה in the accusative, or whether it is to be regarded as construct state, and עֹלֶה as the genitive. In the latter case it would be analogous to Pr 14² (see k).

k. 4. The passive participles also may either be in the absolute state, and take the determining word in the accusative,² or may be connected

¹ When, as in Jb 40¹⁹, the participle with the noun-suffix הָעֹשֵׂי *he that made him*, also has the article (cf. § 127 i), the anomaly is difficult to understand, since a word determined by a genitive does not admit of being determined by the article.—No less remarkable is the use of the constr. st. of the participle before the accusative in Jer 33²² מְשֻׁרְתִּי אֲתִי *that minister unto me* (for which there is מְשֻׁרְתִּי in verse 21). In Am 4¹³ an accusative of the product follows the genitive of the object, עֹשֶׂה שָׁחַר עֵיפָה *maker of the morning into darkness*. In Jer 2¹⁷ בָּעֵת כִּלְכָּךְ *is supposed to mean at the time when he led thee*; perhaps the perfect (הוֹלִי) should be read as in 6¹⁵. In Ez 27⁸⁴, the ancient versions read עַתָּה (ה) נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ *now thou art broken*, instead of the difficult עַתָּה נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ. In 1 K 20⁴⁰ read עֹשֶׂה בְּהֵנָּה וְהֵנָּה.

² On the proper force of this accusative when retained in the passive con-

with it in the construct state, e.g. Ju 18¹¹, 1 S 2¹⁸, Ez 9² לְבוּשׁ בָּדִים *clothed in linen*, cf. verse 3 הַלְבֵּשׁ הַבְּדִים; (even with a suffix קָרַע בְּחִנְתּוֹ *rent as regards his coat* 2 S 15³²; with the participle following Ju 1⁷); but Ez 9¹¹ לְבוּשׁ הַבְּדִים *the one clothed with linen*; 2 S 13³¹ קָרַע בְּגָדִים *rent in respect of clothes*, equivalent to *with their clothes rent* (cf. Jer 41⁵); Nu 24⁴, Dt 25¹⁰, Is 3³, 33²⁴, Jo 1⁸, ψ 32¹ נְשׁוּי־פָשַׁע *forgiven in respect of transgression*, הִטָּאָה בְּסוֹי *covered in respect of sin*); with a suffix to the noun, Pr 14² נָלוֹךְ דְּרָכָיו *he that is perverse in his ways*.

Rem. The passive participle occurs in the construct state before a genitive of the cause, e.g. in Is 1⁷ שָׂרְפוֹת אֵשׁ *burnt with fire*; cf. Gn 41⁶, Ex 28¹¹, Dt 32²⁴; before a genitive denoting the author, e.g. Gn 24³¹ בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה *blessed of the Lord* (but ψ 115¹⁵ לַיהוָה בְּרוּכִים, see § 121 f); cf. Is 53⁴, ψ 22⁷, Jb 14¹ (15¹⁴, 25⁴); hence also with noun-suffixes (which are accordingly genitive) Pr 9¹⁸ קְרָאָהָּ *her invited ones*, i.e. those invited by her; cf. 7²⁶, ψ 37²².

5. The use of the participle as predicate is very frequent in noun-*m* clauses (which, according to § 140 e, describe established facts and states), in which the period of time intended by the description must again (see above, d) be inferred from the context. Thus:

(a) As *present*, in speaking of truths which hold good at all times, e.g. Ec 1⁴ נָא דֹר הָלֶךְ וְדֹר בָּא *one generation goeth, and another generation cometh*; and the earth abideth (עֹמֶדֶת) *for ever*; cf. verse 7; also to represent incidental (continuous) occurrences which are just happening, Gn 3⁵, 16⁸ (I am fleeing); 32¹², Ex 9¹⁷, 1 S 16¹⁵, 23¹, 2 K 7⁹, Is 1⁷; when the subject is introduced by the emphatic demonstrative הִנֵּה *behold!* (§ 100 o and § 105 b), e.g. Gn 16¹¹ הִנֵּךְ הָרָה *behold, thou art with child*, &c.; 27⁴²; frequently also in circumstantial clauses (connected by Wāw), cf. § 141 e, e.g. Gn 15², &c.

(b) To represent *past* actions or states, sometimes in independent noun-*o* clauses, e.g. Ex 20¹⁸ וְכָל־הָעָם רָאוּ אֶת־הַקּוֹל *and all the people saw the thunders*, &c.; 1 K 1⁵; in negative statements, e.g. Gn 39^{23 a}; sometimes in relative clauses, e.g. Gn 39^{23 b}, Dt 3² (cf. also the frequent combination of the participle with the article as the equivalent of a relative clause, e.g. Gn 32¹⁰ הָאִמֶּר *which saidst*; 12⁷, 16¹³, 35^{1,3}, 36³⁵, 48¹⁶, 2 S 15³¹, &c.); sometimes again (see n) in circumstantial clauses, especially those representing actions or states which occurred simultaneously with other past actions, &c., e.g. Gn 19¹ *and the two angels came to Sodom* יֹשֵׁב וְלוֹט *and* (i.e. while) Lot sat, &c.; 18^{1.8.16.22}, 25²⁶, Ju 13⁹, 2 Ch 22⁹; also with the subject introduced by הִנֵּה 37⁷, 41¹⁷. (On הָלֶךְ with a following adjective or participle to express an action constantly or occasionally recurring, cf. § 113 u.)

(c) To announce *future* actions or events, e.g. 1 K 2², 2 K 4¹⁶ *at this season* p *when the time cometh round*, אַתָּה חֲבֵקֶת בֶּן *thou shalt embrace a son*; so after a specification of time, Gn 7⁴, 15¹⁴, 17¹⁹, 19¹³, Hag 2⁶ (but in Is 23¹⁵, where, after וְהָיָה we should rather expect a perfect consecutive, it is better to explain

struction cf. below, § 117 cc, &c., and § 121 c, d. So also Neh 4¹² is to be understood, *and the builders were girded every one with his sword on his side, and building*.

וְנִשְׁחַת, with Qimhi, as the 3rd sing. fem. of the perfect; on the form, cf. § 44 f); or in relative clauses, Gn 41²⁵, Is 5⁵ *what I am doing*, i. e. am in the act of doing; in a deliberative question, Gn 37³⁰; but especially often when the subject is introduced by הִנֵּה (especially also if the subject be attached as a suffix to הִנֵּה as הִנְנִי, הִנֵּךְ, &c.), if it is intended to announce the event as imminent, or at least near at hand (and sure to happen), when it is called *futurum instans*, e. g. Gn 6¹⁷, 15³, 20³, 24^{13f.}, 46²¹, 50⁵, Ex 3¹³, 8²⁵, 9³, 34¹⁰, Jos 2¹⁸, Ju 7¹⁷, 9³³, 1 S 3¹¹, 2 K 7², Is 3¹, 7¹⁴, 17¹, Jer 30¹⁰, Zc 2¹³, 3⁸; with a participle passive, 2 S 20²¹: cf. also § 112 l.

q Rem. 1. As the above examples show, a noun-clause with a participle as predicate may have for its subject either a substantive or a personal pronoun; in both cases the participle, especially if there be a certain emphasis upon it, may precede the subject. Also in noun-clauses introduced by הִנֵּה the subject may be either a substantive, or (e. g. Gn 37⁷) a separate personal pronoun, or a suffix attached to הִנֵּה. In the same way, the subject may also be introduced by יֵשׁ (*est*, see the Lexicon) with a suffix, and in negative sentences by אֵין (*non est*) with a suffix, e. g. Ju 6³⁶ אִם-יִשְׁךָ מוֹשִׁיעַ *if thou wilt save*; Gn 43⁵ אִם-אֵינְךָ מוֹשִׁלֵּם *if thou wilt not send*; 1 S 19¹¹.—In such cases as Is 14²⁷ הַנְּטוּיָה יָדוֹ *the stretched out hand is his*, הַנְּטוּיָה is not, like נְטוּיָה in 9¹¹⁻¹⁶, &c., the predicate (in which case the participle could not take the article), but the subject; cf. Gn 2¹¹, 45¹², Is 66⁹, Ez 20²⁹, Zc 7⁶ (cf. § 126 k), where the participle with the article likewise refers to the present, also Nu 7², Dt 3²¹, 4³, &c., 1 S 4¹⁶, where it refers to the past. In 1 K 12⁸ and 21¹¹ even in relative clauses after אֲשֶׁר.

r 2. To give express emphasis to an action continuing in the *past*, the perfect הָיָה in the corresponding person is sometimes added to the participle, and similarly the imperfect יִהְיֶה (or the jussive יִהְיֶה, or the imperfect consecutive) is used to emphasize an action continuing in the *future*, e. g. Jb 14¹⁴ הַבָּקָר הָיָה הֹרֶשֶׁת *the oxen (cows) were plowing*; Gn 37², 39²², Ex 3¹, Dt 9²⁴, Ju 1⁷, 1 S 2¹¹, 2 S 3³; the same occurs with a passive participle, e. g. Jos 5⁵, Zc 3³; יִהְיֶה with a participle is found e. g. in Is 2²; the jussive in Gn 1⁶, ψ 109¹²;¹ and יִהְיֶה with a participle in Ju 16²¹, Neh 1⁴.

s 3. The *personal pronoun* which would be expected as the subject of a participial clause is frequently omitted, or at least (as elsewhere in noun-clauses, cf. Is 26³, ψ 16⁸, Jb 9³²) the pronoun of the 3rd pers. הוּא, e. g. Gn 24³⁰, 37¹⁶, 38²⁴, 41¹, 1 S 10¹¹, 15¹², Is 29⁸ (the participle always after הִנֵּה); cf., moreover, Gn 32⁷, Dt 33³, 1 S 17²⁵, 20¹, Is 33⁵, 40¹⁹, ψ 22²⁹, 33⁵, 55²⁰, Jb 12^{17.19} π., 25², 26⁷.—הוּא is omitted in Lv 18²⁸; הִנֵּה in Is 32¹², Ez 8¹², Neh 9³; in a relative clause, Gn 39²², Is 24².—The *personal pronoun* of the 2nd pers. masc. (אַתָּה) is omitted in Hb 2¹⁰; the 2nd fem. (אַתְּ) in Gn 20¹⁶ (where, however, for the participle וְנִכְחַת the 2nd fem. perf. וְנִכְחַת is to be read); the pronoun of the 1st sing. in Hb 1⁵ (?), Zc 9¹², Mal 2¹⁶; the 2nd plur. (אַתֶּם) 1 S 2²⁴ (if the text be right), 6³, Ez 13⁷ (?). But these passages are all more or less doubtful.

t Of a different kind are the cases in which some undefined subject is to be supplied with the participle; e. g. Is 21¹¹ אֶלַי קָרָא *there is one calling unto me* (= one calleth; § 144 d); cf. Is 30²⁴, 33⁴.—So with participles in the plur., e. g. Ex 5¹⁶ (אֲמָרִים sc. the taskmasters); Jer 38²³ (in 33⁵ the text is corrupt), Ez 13⁷ (?), 36¹⁸, 37¹¹ (equivalent to *sunt qui dicant*).

¹ A jussive is practically to be supplied also in the formulae of blessing and cursing, בָּרוּךְ *blessed be* . . . Gn 9²⁶, &c.; אָרוּר *cursed art thou* . . . 3¹⁴, &c.

4. We must mention as a special class those noun-clauses which occur at *u* the beginning of a period, and are intended to lay stress upon the fact that the first action still continues on the occurrence of the second (always introduced by *וְ*); e.g. Jb 1¹⁶ *וְהָיָה כְּדִבְרֵי יְהוָה בָּא* *he was yet speaking, and (= when) another came, &c.*¹; cf. Gn 29⁹, 1 S 9^{11,27}, 2c³⁶, 1 K 14¹⁷ *she was entering the threshold of the house, when the child died*; 2 K 2²³, 4⁵, Dn 9²⁰^{f.}; also in Ju 19²², 1 S 9¹⁴, 17²³, 1 K 1⁴², Jb 1¹⁸^{f.}, in all which passages the apodosis is introduced by *וְהָיָה*.—On the other hand, in 1 K 1¹⁴ the noun-clause itself is introduced by *הִנֵּה* (as in verse 22 by *וְהִנֵּה*), and denotes an action only just impending.² Finally, when the whole sentence is introduced by means of *וְהָיָה* (cf. § 111 g), and the apodosis by *וְהָיָה*, Gn 42³⁵, 2 K 2¹¹, 13²¹; without *הִנֵּה* in the apodosis, 1 S 7¹⁰, 2 K 19³⁷ (Is 37³⁸).

Participles active, which are used in the sense of the perfect participle, and *ו* also *participles passive*, in accordance with their meaning, express in such noun-clauses a state still continuing on the occurrence of the principal action, e.g. Gn 38²⁵ *וְהָיָה מוֹצֵאתָ וְהָיָה שְׁלֵחָה* *she was being brought forth, when she sent, &c.*; cf. Gn 50²⁴. [See further in Driver, *Tenses*, §§ 166–169.]

5. Different from the examples treated in *u* and *v* are the instances in *w* which a participle (either alone or as the attribute of a noun) stands at the beginning of the sentence as a *casus pendens* (or as the subject of a compound noun-clause, see § 143 c) to indicate a condition, the contingent occurrence of which involves a further consequence; e.g. Gn 9⁶ *וְשָׁפַךְ דָּם הָאָדָם בָּאָדָם דָּמוֹ יִשָּׁפַךְ* *shedding man's blood, i. e. if any one sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed*; Ex 21¹², ψ 75⁴, Pr 17¹⁴, Jb 41¹⁸; so especially if *כָּל־* every precedes the participle, Gn 4¹⁵, 1 S 3¹¹ (2 K 21¹²), 2 S 5⁸ (*whosoever smiteth*), 1 Ch 11⁶. The apodosis is very often introduced by *וְ* (*wāw apodosis*), e.g. Ex 12¹⁵ (with a following perfect consecutive), Nu 35⁸⁰; 1 S 2¹³ *וְהָיָה אִישׁ וְיָבִיחַ* *and it came to pass, that as many as came, &c.* [or by *וְהָיָה*, frequentative, Ju 19⁸⁰].—On the other hand, *וְהִנֵּה שִׁבְרָתָהּ* Dn 8²² is a mere catchword (equivalent to *and as for that which was broken*) to call to mind the contents of verse 8.

6. On the use of the participle after the infinitive absolute *הָלֹךְ* cf. § 113 u.

7. Almost as a rule the participial construction beginning a sentence (like *x* the infinitival constructions according to § 114 r) is continued by means of a finite verb with or without *וְ*, before which the English construction requires us to supply the relative pronoun implied in the participle; thus,

¹ The independent noun-clause here lays stress upon the simultaneous occurrence (and consequently the overlapping) of the events far more forcibly than could be done by a subordinate expression of time (as e.g. *וְהָיָה כְּדִבְרֵי*). In English it may be represented by *scarcely had he finished speaking when. . .* As the above examples show, the apodosis also frequently consists of a noun-clause.

² At the same time the preceding *עוֹד* *still* shows that what is announced is not merely a future event, but a future event *contemporaneous* with something else; the case thus entirely differs from the examples given in § 112 t, where *הִנֵּה* refers to the following participle, while here it belongs properly to the apodosis, before which it is therefore generally placed; see the examples.

continued by means of a perfect, Is 14¹⁷ שָׁם תִּבְלֶה בְּמִדְבָּר וְעָרָיו הָרָס that made the world as a wilderness, and overthrew the cities thereof¹; 43⁷, Ez 22³, ψ 136¹³ π., Pr 2¹⁷; by a perfect without Wāw, Gn 49¹¹; by a simple imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae* in the present), Is 5²³, 46⁶, Pr 7⁸, Jb 12^{17, 19} π., 24²¹; by an imperfect without Wāw, e. g. 1 S 2⁸, Is 5⁸, Pr 2¹⁴, 19²⁶; by an imperfect consecutive, Gn 27³³, 35³, 1 S 2⁶, Jer 13¹⁰ (after several participles); ψ 18³³, 136¹⁰ f.

C. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE VERB.

§ 117. The Direct Subordination of the Noun to the Verb as Accusative of the Object. The Double Accusative.

L. Kaila, *Zur Syntax des in verbaler Abhängigkeit stehenden Nomens im alttest. Hebr.,* Helsingfors, 1906.

- α 1. The simplest way in which a noun is subordinated to a verbal form is by the addition of an accusative of the object to a transitive verb.² In the absence of case-endings,³ this accusative can now be recognized only from the context, or by the particle אֵת (את), before suffixes also אֵת, אֹת (אות)⁴ prefixed to it. The use of this *nota accusativi*

¹ On the parallelism between the external and internal members, which appears here and in many other examples of this kind, see the note on § 114 r.

² The verb in question may either have been originally transitive, or only have become transitive by a modification of its original meaning. Thus the vocalization shows that חָפֵץ (to have pleasure, usually with ב) to desire, מָלֵא (to be full of something, also transitive) to fill, were originally intransitive. Cf. also such cases as בָּכָה to weep (generally with עַל-אֵל, or ל), but also to bewail with an accusative; יָשַׁב to dwell (usually with ב), but also to inhabit with an accusative (cf. further, under u).—The examples are different in which verbs of motion such as בָּוא intrare, also aggredi, יָצָא egredi (cf. § 116 h above), נָשַׁב redire, Is 52⁸, take an accusative of the aim of the motion, while בָּוא according to the Old Semitic usage, even takes an accusative of the person (at least in poetry, equivalent to בָּוא אֶל- in prose).

³ On traces of these endings, especially the remains of a former accusative ending in a, cf. § 90 c.

⁴ אֵת (toneless owing to the following Maqqeph), and אֹת (with a tone-long ē, אֵת only in Jb 41²⁶), אֵת or אֹת before the light suffixes (on all these forms cf. § 103 b: the underlying form āth was obscured in Hebrew to ōth, shortened to āth before suffixes beginning with a consonant and then modified to אֵת, whence finally the secondary form אֹת with the tone), Phoenician אֵית i. e. probably iyyāth (for the Phoenician form, cf. G. Hoffmann, *Einige phönik. Inschriften*, Göttingen, 1889, p. 39 f.), Punic yth or (according to Euting) pronounced even as a mere prefixed t, Arabic, before suffixes, 'iyyā, Aram. יֵת, יֹת. It was no doubt originally a substantive, meaning essence, substance, self (like the Syriac yāth; on the other hand, any connexion with the Hebrew אֹת, Syriac 'atā, Arabic 'āyat, a sign, must, with Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* xl. 738, be rejected), but now united in the construct state with a following noun or suffix stands for the pronoun ipse, αὐτός. In common use, however (cf. Wilson, 'The particle אֵת in Hebrew,' *Hebraica*, vi. 2, 3, and the precise statistics of the use

is, however, somewhat rare in poetry, and even in prose it is not invariably necessary but is restricted to those cases in which the accusative of the object is more closely determined by being a proper name, or by having the article, or by a following determinate genitive (hence also by the suffixes), or in some other way (see below, c), e. g. Gn 4¹ and she bare אֶת־לֵךְ Cain; 6¹⁰, 1¹ God created אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ the heaven and the earth (but 2⁴ אֶרֶץ וְשָׂמַיִם); 1²⁵ and God made אֶת־חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ the beast of the earth; 2²⁴.

Rem. 1. The rare occurrence of the *nota accusativi* in poetic style (e. g. it never occurs in Ex 15²⁻¹⁸, Dt 32, Ju 5, 1 S 2, &c., though it is frequent in the late Psalms) may be explained from the fact that in this as in other respects (cf. § 2 q) poetry represents a somewhat more archaic stage of the language than prose. The need of some external means of indicating the accusative could only have been felt after the case-endings had become wholly extinct. Even then the אֶת would probably have been used at first to indicate only an object placed before the verb (when it followed, it was already sufficiently characterized by its position as depending on the verb), or proper names.¹ Finally, however, the *nota accusativi* became so customary everywhere in prose, that even the pronominal object was expressed rather by אֶת with suffixes than by verbal suffixes, even when none of the reasons mentioned under e can be assigned for it; cf. Giesebrecht in ZAW. 1881, p. 258 ff., and the statistics of H. Petri, cited above at the head of § 58. Such examples as כָּל אֲשֶׁר־צָוָהוּ יְהוָה Gn 6²² in the Priestly Code, beside אֲשֶׁר־צָוָהוּ יְהוָה 7⁵ in the Jahvist, are especially instructive.

2. As accusatives determined in other ways, we have in the first place to consider the collectives introduced by כָּל entirely, without a following article or determinate genitive, inasmuch as the meaning of כָּל includes a determinative sense, cf. e. g. Gn 1²¹⁻³⁰, 8²¹, Dt 2³⁴, 2 K 25⁹. אֶת־כָּל is used absolutely in Gn 9³, cf. 39²³; similarly, מִי is determinate of itself, since it always denotes a person, hence אֶת־מִי quem? e. g. Is 6², 37²³, &c., but never אֶת־מָה quid? So also the relative אֲשֶׁר in the sense of *eum qui* or *quem*, &c., e. g. 1 S 16³, or *id quod*, Gn 9³⁴, &c. Cf. also such examples as Jos 2¹⁰, 1 S 24¹⁹, where אֶת אֲשֶׁר is equivalent to the circumstance, that, &c.—Elsewhere אֶת stands before nouns which are determinate in sense, although the article is omitted, which according to § 126 h is very frequently the case in poetic or otherwise elevated style; thus Lv 26⁵, Jos 24^{14,15}, Is 41⁷ (to distinguish the object from the subject); 50⁴ (with the first of two accusatives, also for the sake of clearness); Ez 13²⁰, 43¹⁰, Pr 13²¹ (where the צִדִּיקִים are to be regarded as a distinct class); Jb 13²⁵

of אֶת on p. 140 ff.), it has so little force (like the oblique cases αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ, αὐτόν, sometimes also *ipsius*, *ipsum*, and the Germ. *desselben*, &c.) that it merely serves to introduce a determinate object; אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם prop. αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν (cf. αὐτῇν Χρυσήδα, Iliad i. 143) is no stronger than the simple הַשָּׁמַיִם τὸν οὐρανόν. Cf., further, P. Haupt on Pr 18²⁴ in his Rainbow Bible, and also in the Notes on Esther, p. 191.

¹ Thus, in Dt 33, אֶת occurs only in verse 9 (twice, with an object preceding the verb), in Gn 49 in the blessing of Jacob only in verse 15 with a co-ordinate second object (consequently farther removed from the verb). Of the thirteen instances of אֶת in the Meša' inscription, seven stand directly and four indirectly before proper names.

(unless, with Beer and others, we read וְאִם for וְאֵת); also Ec 7⁷ may be a quotation of an ancient maxim.

d On the other hand אֵת occurs very seldom in prose before a noun actually or apparently undetermined. In 1 S 24⁶ בָּנָה is more closely defined by means of the following relative clause; in 2 S 4¹¹ אִישׁ צָדִיק refers to Ishbo-sheth (as if it were *him, who was an innocent man*); in 1 K 6¹⁶ עֲשָׂרִים אַמָּה refers to the particular twenty cubits. In Ex 21²⁸ (otherwise in verse 29) perhaps the אֵת is used in order to avoid the combination שׁוֹר אִישׁ (as in Nu 21⁹ to avoid the cacophony אִישׁ הִנָּחֵשׁ אִישׁ (?)); in Lv 7⁸ and 20¹⁰ the accusatives are at any rate defined by the context.—In Nu 16¹⁵ אֶת־אֲחֵר מֵהֶם probably means *even a single one* (and then *ipso facto* a definite one) of them, as also in 1 S 9³ מִן־נָעָרִים אֶת־אֲחֵר may refer to some definite one of the men-servants. In Gn 21³⁰ we should read אֶת־שִׁבְעַת הַבָּכָשֶׁת with the Samaritan, since the seven lambs have been already mentioned; in Ex 2¹ translate with Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 79, אֶת־בֶּת־לֵוִי the daughter of Levi; in Ex 28⁹ read הַשֶּׁהֶם with the Samaritan; in Lv 20¹⁴ אֶת־אִשָּׁה is probably a scribal error due to אֶת־אִמָּה; in 1 S 26²⁰ read נִפְשִׁי with the LXX for אֲחֵר; in 2 S 5²⁴ read הַצֶּעֳדָה as in 1 Ch 14¹⁵; in 2 S 15¹⁶ the אֵת is incorrectly inserted from 20³, where it refers to the women already mentioned; in 2 S 18¹⁸ read הַמִּצָּבֶת, or omit both אֵת and אִשָּׁר with the LXX and Lucian; in 1 K 12³¹ omit אֵת; in 2 K 23²⁰ probably אֶת־עַצְמוֹתֶם is to be read; in 2 K 25⁹ the text is corrupt. In Ez 16³² אֶת־זָרִים might refer to *the strangers in question*; but see Smend on the passage.

e 3. The pronominal object *must* be represented by אֵת with a suffix (instead of a verbal suffix), when (a) it precedes the verb, e.g. Nu 22²³ אֶתְּכָה הָרָנִתִּי וְאוֹתָהּ הַחַיִּיתִי *I had slain thee and saved her alive*; Gn 7¹, Lv 22²⁸, 1 S 8⁷, Is 43²², 57¹¹, Jer 4^{17, 22}, 7¹⁹; (b) when a suffix is already attached to the verb, and as a rule when a second accusative with ו follows, e.g. 2 S 15²⁵ וְהִרְאֵנִי אֹתוֹ *and he will show me it*; Ex 17³ לְהָמִית אֹתִי וְאֶת־בָּנַי *to kill us and our children*; Nu 16³², 1 S 5¹¹, 2 S 14¹⁶ (but cf. also Dt 11⁶, 15¹⁶, &c., and Driver on 1 S 5¹⁰); (c) after an infinitive absolute, see above § 113 a note; (d) after an infinitive construct, when it is immediately followed by the subject, e.g. Gn 41³⁹, or when the combination of a suffix with the infinitive might lead to a misunderstanding, e.g. Gn 4¹⁵ לְבַלְתִּי הַכּוֹת־אֹתוֹ *lest one should smite him, &c.*, where לְבַלְתִּי הַכּוֹת might also mean *lest he should smite*.

f 4. The pronominal object is very frequently omitted, when it can be easily supplied from the context; so especially the neuter accusative referring to something previously mentioned (the English *it*) after *verba sentiendi* (שָׁמַע) and *dicendi*, e.g. Gn 9²², &c., וַיֹּדֶר *and he told (it)*; also after נָתַן *to give*, Gn 18⁷, 24⁴¹, &c., לָקַח *to take*, הָבִיא *to bring*, שָׁם *to lay*, Gn 9²³, &c., מָצָא *to find*, Gn 31³³, &c. A personal object is omitted, e.g. in Gn 12¹⁹, 24⁵¹ (after לָקַח).—The omission of the plural object is remarkable, because it leaves an opportunity for a misunderstanding, in Gn 37¹⁷ שָׁמַעְתִּי אִמְרִים ¹ *I heard them saying*; perhaps, however, we should read שָׁמַעְתִּים with the Samaritan.

g 5. In common formulae the substantival object is also sometimes omitted

¹ According to the ordinary rules of syntax (cf. § 116 t) we should translate, *I heard men who said, &c.*

(an elliptical expression); thus e.g. כָּרַת 1 S 20¹⁶, &c. (see the Lexicon) stands for כָּרַת כָּרַת like the English *to close* (sc. a bargain) with any one; נָטַר (sc. אַף *anger*) equivalent to *to be resentful*, ψ 103⁹, &c.; so also שָׁמַר Jer 3⁵ (beside נָטַר); נָשָׂא for נָשָׂא קוֹל *to lift up the voice*, Is 37; לָּ for נָשָׂא לָּ *to take away any one's sin* (to forgive), Gn 18^{24, 26}, Is 2⁹; שָׁלַח *to put forth* (sc. יָד the hand) equivalent to *to reach after something*, 2 S 6⁶, ψ 18¹⁷.

6. *Verba sentiendi* may take a second object, generally in the form of a participle or adjective and necessarily indeterminate, to define more exactly the action or state in which the object is perceived, e.g. Nu 11¹⁰ וַיִּשְׁמַע מֹשֶׁה וַיִּבְכֶּה אֶת-הָעָם and *Moses heard the people weeping*; Gn 7¹ וַיֵּרְא אֱתָנָה רִאֲיוֹתַי צָדִיק *they have I seen righteous*. Frequently, however, the second object is expressed by a separate clause. This is especially frequent with רָאָה *to see*, e.g. Gn 1⁴ and *God saw the light, that it was good*; Gn 6², 12¹⁴, 13¹⁰, 49¹⁵, Ex 2², ψ 25¹⁹, Pr 23³¹, Jb 22¹², Ec 2²⁴, 8¹⁷; so with יָדַע *to know*, Ex 32²², 2 S 3²⁵, 17⁸ (with two objects); 1 K 5¹⁷.

7. In certain instances אֵת serves apparently to introduce or to emphasize *i* a nominative. This cannot be regarded as a reappearance of the original substantival meaning of the אֵת, since all unquestionable examples of the kind belong to the later Books of the Old Testament. They are rather (apart from textual errors or other explanations) cases of virtual dependence on an implied *verbum regens* understood. The constant use of אֵת to indicate a clause governed by the verb, necessarily led at length to the use of אֵת generally as a defining particle irrespective of a governing verb. So in the Hebrew of the Mishna¹ (see above, § 3 a) אֵתוֹ and אֵתָה are prefixed even to a nominative without any special emphasis.

Naturally the above does not apply to any of the places in which אֵת is not *k* the *nota accusativi*, but a preposition (on אֵת with, cf. § 103 a), e.g. Is 57¹⁵, 1 S 17³⁴ וַיָּאֶת-הַדּוֹב and *that, with a bear*; אֵת here, however, has probably been interpolated from verse 36, where it is wanting); nor the places in which the accusative is subordinate to a passive (according to § 121 c) or to a verb of wanting as in Jos 22¹⁷ and Neh 9³², see below, z. In Ez 43¹⁷ קָרִיב אֵתָה governs like a verb, being followed by אֵתָה.

Other cases are clearly due to attraction to a following relative pronoun in *l* the accusative (Ez 14²², Zc 8¹⁷; but Hag 2^{5a}, to מַמְצְרִים, must be omitted, with the LXX, as a later addition), or the accusative depends on a verbal idea, virtually contained in what has gone before, and consequently present to the speaker's mind as governing the accusative. Thus Nu 3²⁶ (the verbal idea contained in וּמִשְׁמֶרֶת verse 25 is *they had to take charge of*); in Jos 17¹¹ וַיְהִי לָּ implies *it was given up or they gave him*; 1 S 26¹⁶ see where is equivalent to *search now for*; in 2 S 11²⁵ אֶל-יָדַע בְּעֵינַי is used in the sense of *noli aegre ferre*²; Jer 36³³ and he had the brazier before him; in Ec 4³ a verb like *I esteem* is mentally supplied before אֵת אֲשֶׁר. On Jos 22¹⁷, Neh 9³², see below, aa.—Aposiopesis occurs in Dt 11² for *not your children* (do I mean); still more boldly in Zc 7⁷, where either שְׁמַעְתֶּם or תִּשְׁמְעוּ (תַּעֲשׂוּ) is to be supplied.

Setting aside a few undoubtedly corrupt passages³ there still remain the *m*

¹ Cf. Weiss, משפט לשון המשנה (Vienna, 1867), p. 112.

² So also in 1 S 20¹³ the Qal (יִיטֵב) is, with Wellhausen, to be read instead of the Hiph'il.

³ Thus 1 S 26¹⁶, where וַיֵּא is to be read for וַיָּאֵת; 1 K 11²⁵, where at present the predicate of the relative clause is wanting; in 2 K 6⁵ the אֵת is probably

following examples, in which אַתְּ in the later Hebrew manner (almost in the sense of the Latin *quod attinet ad*) introduces a noun with more or less emphasis, Nu 3⁴⁶, 5¹⁰, 35⁶, Ju 20^{44,46}, Ez 17²¹, 20¹⁶, 35¹⁰, 44³, Neh 9^{19,34}, Dn 9¹³, 2 Ch 31¹⁷.—In Ez 47¹⁷⁻¹⁹ (cf. also 43⁷) it is simplest to emend וְאַתְּ for אַתְּ, according to verse 20. However, even the LXX, who have *radra* only in verse 18, can hardly have known any other reading than אַתְּ; consequently in all these passages אַתְּ must be regarded as virtually dependent on some governing word, such as *ecce* (LXX 43⁷ ἐῶπακας), and 47^{17 ff.} as equivalent to *thou shalt have as a border*, &c.

- n 8. Another solecism of the later period is finally the introduction of the object by the preposition לְ (prop. *in relation to, in the direction of*), as sometimes in Ethiopic¹ and very commonly in Aramaic.² Less remarkable is this looser connexion of the object with a participle, as with אֹכֵל La 4⁵, אִסֵּף Nu 10²⁵, וְזָקַף ψ 145¹⁴ (but cf. 146⁸), צָרַר Nu 25¹⁸, הַשְׁנִיָּא and נִשְׁטַח Jb 12²³; before the participle Is 11⁹.—To introduce an object *preceding* the finite verb לְ is employed in Jb 5² (cf. also Dn 11³¹); also *after* אָהֵב Lv 19^{18,34}; הֶאֱרִיף ψ 129³; הִבְדִּיל Ezr 8²⁴, 2 Ch 25¹⁰; הִבִּין Jb 9¹¹; בִּרְךָ 1 Ch 29²⁰ (immediately before with an accusative); הִנֵּלָה 1 Ch 5²⁶; דָּרַשׁ Ezr 6²¹, 1 Ch 22¹⁹, 2 Ch 17¹³; הִחִיָּה Gn 45⁷, where, however, read פָּלִיטָה with the LXX for לְפָלִיטָה and take לָכֶם as a *dativus commodi*; הִלָּל 1 Ch 16³⁶, 2 Ch 5¹³; הִרְבַּ 2 S 33³⁰, ψ 135¹¹ (verse 10 with accusative), 136^{19 f.}; חָבַשׁ (to bind up) Is 61¹ (Ez 34⁴ before the verb); יָרַע ψ 69⁶; כָּבַד ψ 86⁹; לָקַח Jer 40², 2 Ch 23¹; הִמְלִיךְ and מָנַשׁ 1 Ch 29²²; נָהַל 2 Ch 28¹⁵; סָמָה ψ 145¹⁴; עֹבֵד 1 Ch 16³⁷; הֶעֱלָה Ez 26³; פָּתַח ψ 116¹⁶; רָדַף Jb 19²⁸; הִצְרִיק Is 53¹¹; שָׁכַר 2 Ch 24¹² (previously accusatives); שִׁים 1 S 22⁷ (but probably וְנִלְכֶם is to be read); הֵשִׁיב (in the connexion לְ הֵשִׁיב דָּבָר 1 Ch 10⁶ (but verse 9 and 1 K 12⁹ with an accusative); שָׁחַח Nu 32¹⁵, 1 S 23¹⁰; שִׁית ψ 73¹⁸; שָׁלַח Ezr 8¹⁶, 2 Ch 21², 17⁷; נִשְׁמַר 1 Ch 29¹⁸, 2 Ch 5¹¹.

- O 9. Sometimes the verb, on which an accusative of the object really depends, is contained only in sense in the verb which apparently governs, e.g. Is 14¹⁷ אֲסִירָיו לֹא-פָתַח בֵּיתָהּ *his prisoners he let not loose nor sent them back to their home*. Cf. ψ 74¹⁵ and on this *constructio praegnans* in general, see § 119 ff.

- p 2. With the proper accusatives of the object may also be classed what is called the *internal* or *absolute object* (also named *schema etymologicum* or *figura etymologica*), i.e. the addition of an object in the form

derived from a text which read the Hiph'il instead of נָפַל. In Jer 23³³ instead of the artificial explanation *what a burden* (is, do ye ask?) we should read with the LXX and Vulg. אַתֶּם הַמָּזֵא *ye are the burden*. In Ez 10²² מְרִאֵיהֶם וְאוֹתָם is unintelligible; in 37¹⁹ read with Hitzig אֶל- for אַתְּ; in Hag 2¹⁷ for אַתְּכֶם read with the LXX שְׁבַכְּם [or אֵינְכֶם; for the אֶל cf. 2 K 6¹¹, Jer 15¹, Ez 36⁹].

¹ Dillmann, *Grammatik der äthiopischen Sprache*, p. 349.

² With regard to Biblical Aramaic, see Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 151 f. In other ways, also, a tendency may be observed in later Hebrew to make use of the looser connexion by means of prepositions instead of the closer subordination of the noun in the accusative.

of a noun derived from the same stem,¹ e.g. ψ 14⁵ פָּחַדוּ פָּחַדוּ they feared a fear (i.e. they were in great fear), Pr 15²⁷; also with the object preceding, e.g. La 1⁸ יְרוּשָׁלַם חָטָא חָטָא *Jerusalem hath sinned a sin*; with a double accusative (see below, cc), e.g. 1 K 1¹² אֵינְעָךְ נָא עֲצָה let me, I pray thee, give thee counsel; 4 S 1⁶.²

Rem. (a) Strictly speaking the only cases of this kind are those in which the verbal idea is supplemented by means of an *indeterminate* substantive (see the examples above). Such a substantive, except in the case of the addition of the internal object to denominative verbs (see below), is, like the infinitive absolute, never altogether without force, but rather serves like it to strengthen the verbal idea. This strengthening is implied in the indeterminateness of the internal object, analogous to such exclamations as, *this was a man!*³ Hence it is intelligible that some intensifying attribute is very frequently (as in Greek usually) added to the internal object, e.g. Gn 27³⁴ וַיַּעֲקֹב עֲצָקָה וְרִלָּה וַיִּמָּרָר וַיִּמָּרָר he cried (with) an exceeding great and bitter cry; cf. the Greek νοσείν νόσον κακὴν, ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην (Matt. 2¹⁰); *magnam pugnare pugnam, tutiorem vitam vivere*, &c.

Examples of an internal object *after* the verb, and without further addition, are Ex 22⁵, 2 S 12¹⁶, Is 24²², 35², 42¹⁷, Ez 25¹⁵, 26¹⁵, 27³⁵, Mic 4⁹, Zc 1², Pr 21²⁶; with an intensifying attribute, Gn 27³³, Ex 32³¹, Ju 15⁸, 2 S 13³⁶, 1 K 1⁴⁰ (cf. Jon 4⁶, 1 Ch 29⁹); Is 21⁷, 45¹⁷, Jon 1¹⁰, Zc 1¹⁴, 8^{2a}, Dn 11³; along with an object proper the internal object occurs with an attribute in Gn 12¹⁷, 2 S 13¹⁵; cf. also Is 14⁶, Jon 4¹.—An internal object without an attribute *before* the verb: Is 24¹⁶, Jer 46⁵, Hb 3⁹, Jb 27¹²; with an attribute *before* the verb: Jer 14¹⁷, Zc 1¹⁵ (cf. also Gn 30⁸, Jer 22¹⁹, 30¹⁴, ψ 139²²). Instead of the substantive which would naturally be expected, another of kindred meaning is used in Zc 8².

(b) Only in a wider sense can the *schema etymologicum* be made to include ⁷ cases in which the denominative verb is used in connexion with the noun from which it is derived, e.g. Gn 1¹¹, 6¹⁴, 11³, 37⁷, Ez 18², ψ 144⁶, probably also Mi 2⁴, or where this substantive, made determinate in some way, follows its verb, e.g. Gn 30³⁷, Nu 25¹¹, 2 K 4¹³, 13¹⁴, Is 45¹⁷, La 3⁵⁸,⁴ and, determinate at least in sense, Jer 22¹⁶; or precedes it, as in 2 K 2¹⁶, Is 8¹², 62⁵, Zc 3⁷; cf. also Ex 3⁹. In both cases the substantive is used, without any special emphasis, merely for clearness or as a more convenient way of connecting the verb with other members of the sentence.

3. Verbs which denote *speaking* (*crying out, weeping*), or any s external act, frequently take a direct accusative of the organ or means by which the action is performed. In this case, however, the accusative must be more closely determined by an attributive adjective or a noun in the genitive. This fact shows the close relation between these accusatives and the *internal objects* treated under p, which also,

¹ On a kindred use of the infinitive absolute as an *internal object*, see above, § 113 w.

² Cf. βουλάς βουλευέιν, Iliad x. 147.

³ The Arab grammarians assign to the indeterminate cases generally an intensive sense in many instances; hence the commentators on the Qorān usually explain such cases by adding *and what . . . !* see § 125 b.

⁴ Also in ψ 13⁴ *lest I sleep the sleep of death*, הַמָּוֶת is only used pregnantly for שְׁנַת הַמָּוֶת (cf. Jer 51³⁹), as צָרָקוֹת Is 33¹⁵ for צָרָקוֹת הַדֶּרֶךְ. On the similar use of הַלֵּךְ הַמָּוֶת in ψ 15², see § 118 n.

according to *q*, mostly take an intensifying attribute. On the other hand, they must not be regarded as adverbial (instrumental) accusatives, nor are they to be classed with the second (neuter) subjects treated below in § 144 l.

t Examples of the accusative following the verb are וַיִּזְעַק קוֹל-גָּדוֹל and I cried a loud voice, i.e. with a loud voice, Ez 11¹³, 2 S 15²³ (after the proper object, Dt 3¹⁹, 1 K 8⁵³); ψ 109² they have spoken unto me לְשׁוֹן שֶׁקֶר a tongue of deceit, i.e. with a lying tongue; Pr 10⁴ he becometh poor עֲשָׂה בְּהֶרְמִיָּה dealing a slack hand, i.e. who dealeth with a slack hand; cf. the German *eine schöne Stimme singen*, to sing a fine voice, *eine tüchtige Klinge schlagen*, to smite a trusty sword, *Schlittschuhe laufen*, to run skates (i.e. to skate), and our *to write a good hand*, *to play ball*, &c.—Examples of the accusative preceding are שִׁפְתֵי רִנָּנוֹת יִהְיוּ-לִי my mouth shall praise with joyful lips, ψ 63⁶; cf. ψ 12³, where a *casus instrumenti* with בְּ follows the accusative.

u 4. Many verbs originally intransitive (sometimes even in form; see *α*, note 2) may be used also as transitives, in consequence of a certain modification of their original meaning, which has gradually become established by usage; cf. e.g. רִיב *to strive*, but also with an accusative *causam alicuius agere* (so even in Is 1¹⁷, &c.; elsewhere with לְ of the person for whom one strives); יָבֵל absolutely *to be able*, with an accusative *to prevail over* any one; הִפִּין *to be inclined* and רָצָה *to have pleasure* (usually with בְּ), with an accusative *to wish for some one or something*; שָׁכַב *cubare*, then in the sense of *concumbere*, originally joined with עִם *cum*, but quite early also with the accusative, equivalent to *comprimere (feminam)*, &c. So in 2 S 13¹⁴, &c., unless in all or some of the passages the preposition אֶת is intended, e.g. אֶת־הָאִתָּה for אִתָּה; in the earlier passages עִם is the more usual.

v Rem. 1. It is certainly difficult to decide whether some verbs, which were afterwards used absolutely or joined with prepositions, were not nevertheless originally transitive, and consequently it is only the supposed original meaning, usually assigned to them in English, which causes them to appear intransitive.¹ In that case there is of course no syntactical peculiarity to be considered, and a list of such verbs would at the most be requisite only for practical purposes. Moreover, it is also possible that certain verbs were originally in use at the same time both as transitive and intransitive, e.g. perhaps לָבַשׁ *to be clothed* along with לְבַשׁ *to put on* (a garment). Finally the analogy of certain transitives in constant use may have led to intransitives of kindred meaning being also united directly with the accusative, so that, in other words, whole classes of verbs came to be regarded in a particular aspect as transitives. See below, *y*.

¹ Thus e.g. עָנָה *to reply* (ἀπεῖθεσθαι τινα), *to answer any one*; צִוָּה *to command* (iubere aliquem); זָכַר *to remember*; קָנָה (also with לְ) *to wait for any one* (to expect any one); בָּשֹׂרָה *to bring glad tidings to any one* (see the *Lexicon*); נֶאֱפָה and נֶאֱפָה *to commit adultery* (adulterare matronam); עָבַר *to serve* (colere); עָרַב *to become surety for* . . . , and many others.

2. The modification of the original meaning becomes especially evident when even reflexive conjugations (*Niph'al*, *Hithpa'al*, &c.) take an accusative (cf. § 57, note 2); e.g. נָבֵא to prophesy, Jer 25¹³; נָסַב (prop. to put oneself round) to surround, Ju 19²²; נָלַחַם to fight, ψ 109³ (where, however, the Qal וַיִּלַּחֲמוּ should be read; cf. ψ 35¹); also הִתְנַלַּח to shave (something) for oneself, Num 6¹⁹; הִתְנַחֵל to take some one for oneself as a possession, Is 14²; הִתְנַבֵּל to make some one an object of craft, Gn 37¹⁸; הִתְנַצֵּל to strip a thing off oneself, Ex 33⁶; הִתְעַבֵּר to bring on oneself the anger of any one, to anger him; הִתְבּוֹנֵן to consider something, Jb 37¹⁴; הִתְפַּרֵּק to break something off from oneself, Ex 32³. In Gn 34⁹ after הִתְחַתְּנוּ make ye marriages, read אֲתָנוּ instead of אֲנִינוּ. Cf. § 54 f.

3. So also it is only owing to a modification of the original meaning of a verb (except where the expression is incorrect, and perhaps derived from the popular language), when sometimes the remoter object (otherwise introduced by ל) is directly subordinated in the form of an accusative suffix, e.g. זֶע 7⁵ הָצוּם צִמְתָּנִי אֲנִי did ye fast at all unto me, even to me? as though to say, have ye be-fasted me? have ye reached me with your fasting? Still more strange is Jb 31¹⁸ גִּדְלָנִי כָאֵב he (the orphan) grew up to me as to a father; cf. Is 27⁴, 65⁵, Jer 31³, and in Aramaic Dn 5⁶; but אָרַץ הַנֶּגֶב נִתְּתָנִי Jos 15¹⁹ is to be regarded as a double accusative after a verb of giving, see ff. In 1 S 2²⁵ read וּפְלָלוּ for וּפָלְלוּ; in Is 44²¹, instead of the *Niph'al*, read הִתְנַשְׁנִי; in Ez 29³ either עֲשִׂיתִיו is to be read with Olshausen or עֲשִׂיתִים (and previously יֵאָרִי) with Smend; in ψ 42⁵ אֶרְדָּה or אֶרְדֶּם; in ψ 55²³ (where König takes יִהְיֶה as he has given it to thee) we must certainly assume a substantive יָהּ (= fate?).

4. Whole classes of verbs, which, according to *v* above, are regarded as *y* transitive, either on account of their original meaning or (for the sake of analogy) by a modification of that meaning, are—

(a) Verba induendi and exuendi, as לָבַשׁ to put on, פָּשַׁט to put off a garment, עָדָה to put on ornaments, to adorn oneself with (cf. also מְשַׁבְּצִים זָהָב enclosed in gold, Ex 28²⁰). Also in poetic expressions such as ψ 65¹⁴ לְבָשׁוּ כְרִים הַצֹּאן the pastures are clothed with flocks, cf. ψ 109²⁹; 104² (עֲטָה); 65^{14b} (עֲטַף), &c.¹

(b) Verba copiae and inopiae (also called verba abundandi and deficienti), as מָלֵא, to be full of something, Ex 8¹⁷; here, and also frequently elsewhere, construed with אֶת, and hence evidently with an accusative; Gn 6¹³; with a personal object, Ex 15⁹ my lust shall be satisfied upon them; with an accusative preceding the verb for the sake of emphasis, e.g. Is 1¹⁵ your hands מָלְאוּ דָמִים are full of blood, cf. Is 22²; so also the *Niph.* נִמְלֵא to fill oneself with something, e.g. Gn 6¹¹, Ex 1⁷ (where the object is connected by אֶת); Is 27¹, 64, Pr 3¹⁰; נִרְעַע to be fructified with, Nu 5²⁸; שָׂרַץ to swarm with, Gn 1^{20.21} Ex 7²⁸; שָׂבַע (שִׂבַע) to be full of, Is 1¹¹, Jo 2¹⁹, Pr 12¹¹; גָּבַר to become strong, to wax mighty in something, Jb 21⁷; פָּרַץ to overflow with something, Pr 3¹⁰ (with the object preceding); יָרַד prop. to descend, poetically also to pour down, to overflow with something (cf. in Greek προρέειν ὕδωρ, δάκρυα στάζειν), e.g. La 3⁴⁸ פָּלְגֵי מַיִם הָרַד עֵינַי mine eye runneth

¹ From the idea of covering oneself with something, we might also, if necessary, explain Ex 30²⁰ מִים יִרְחֲצוּ they shall wash themselves with water; but the reading is simply to be emended to the ordinary בְּמֵיִם.

down (with) rivers of water; 1¹⁶, Jer 9¹⁷, 13¹⁷, ψ 119¹³⁶; so also הָלַךְ to run over with, to flow with, Jo 4¹⁸; נָזַל to gush out with, Jer 9¹⁷; נָטַף to drop, to overflow with, Ju 5⁴, Jo 4^{18a}; פָּרַח to break forth, Ex 9⁹; שָׁטַף to overflow, but also (transitively) to overflow with, probably in Is 10²²; נִבַּח to bud with, Pr 10³¹; so perhaps also עָבַר to pass over, to overflow with, Jer 5²⁸; יָצָא to go forth with, Am 5³.—Especially bold, but still on the analogy of the above examples, is Is 5⁶, where it is said of a vineyard וְעֵלָה שְׁמִיר וְשֵׁתִי but it shall come up (it shall be overgrown) with briars and thorns; cf. Pr 24³¹, and still more boldly, Is 34¹⁸.

aa With the opposite idea, חָסַר to be in want of, to lack, Gn 18²⁸; שָׁבַל to be bereaved of (as though it were to lose), Gn 27⁴⁵.—In Jos 22¹⁷ even הַמֶּעֶט־לָנוּ (prop. was there too little for us of . . . ?) as being equivalent to a verbum inopiae (= had we too little of . . . ?) is construed with an accusative; cf. Neh 9³².

bb (c) Several verbs of dwelling; the accusative in this case expresses either the place or the thing at which or with which any one tarries; thus Gn 4²⁰, ψ 22⁴ after יָשַׁב, cf. § 118 g; Ju 5¹⁷, Is 33¹⁴ after גִּוַר ψ 57⁵ after שָׁכַב; ψ 68⁷, Pr 8¹², Is 33¹⁶ with שָׁכַן; or even the person (the people) with whom any one dwells or is a guest, as ψ 5⁵, 120⁵ after גִּוַר, Gn 30²⁰ after נָבַל, ψ 68¹⁹ with שָׁכַן.

cc 5. Two accusatives (usually one of the person and one of the thing) are governed by—

(a) The causative conjugations (*Pi'el*, *Hiph'il*, sometimes also *Pilpel*, e.g. כִּלְכַּל Gn 47¹², &c.) of verbs which are simply transitive in *Qal*, and hence also of *verba induendi* and *exuendi*, &c. (cf. above a and u, and also y, z), e.g. Ex 33¹⁸ אֶת־כְּבוֹדִי נָא אֶת־פָּרְדֶּךָ show me, I pray thee, thy glory. Thus very frequently הוֹדִיעַ to cause some one to know something; לָמַד docere aliquem aliquid, &c.; cf. further, Gn 41⁴² וַיַּלְבִּישׁ אֹתוֹ בְּגָדֵי־נִשָּׁא and he caused him to put on vestures of fine linen (he arrayed him in vestures, &c.); cf. in the opposite sense, Gn 37²³ (both accusatives after הַפְּשִׁיט introduced by אֶת); so with מָלֵא to fill, to fill up with something, Gn 21¹⁹, 26¹⁵, Ex 28³; אָזַר to gird some one with something, ψ 18³³; עָטַר to crown, ψ 8⁶, &c.; חָסַר to cause some one to lack something, ψ 8⁶; הֵאָכִיל to feed some one with something, Ex 16³²; הִשְׁקָה to make some one drink something, Gn 19^{32π}.

dd (b) Many verbs (even in *Qal*) which express an influence upon the object through some external means. The latter, in this case, is attached as a second object. They are especially—

ee (a) Verbs which express covering, clothing, overlaying, חָנַךְ Ex 29⁹, צָפַה Ex 26²⁹, &c., טוּחַ Ez 13^{10π}, עָטַר ψ 5¹³; cf. also אָבַן Jos 7²⁵, &c.; hence also verbs which express sowing (זָרַע Jud 9⁴⁵, Is 17¹⁰, 30²³), planting (Is 5²), anointing (ψ 45⁸) with anything.

ff (b) Expressions of giving, thus נָתַן Jos 15¹⁹ where* the accusative of the thing precedes; endowing, זָבַר Gn 30²⁰; and its opposite taking away, as קָבַע Pr 22²³; בֵּרַךְ to bless some one with something, Gn 49²⁵, Dt 15¹⁴; to give graciously, חָנַן Gn 33⁵; to sustain (i.e. to support, to maintain, to furnish) with anything,

e.g. Gn 27⁸⁷, ψ 51¹⁴ (סָמַךְ); Ju 19⁵ (סָעַר); to do something to one, גָּמַל Gn 50^{15,17}, 1 S 24¹⁸; cf. also קָרַם to come to meet any one with something, ψ 21⁴, שָׁלַם to repay some one with something (with two accusatives, ψ 35¹², Pr 13²¹), and for the accusative of the person cf. εἶ, *kaōs práttein tivá*. In a wider sense we may also include such phrases as *they hunt every man his brother with a net*, Mi 7²; to shoot at one with arrows, ψ 64⁸ (though this is against the accents); Pr 13²⁴ seeks him early (with) discipline, i.e. chastises him betimes, &c.

(γ) Expressions of asking some one for something, desiring something from *gg* some one (שָׁאַל Dt 14²⁶, ψ 137⁸); answering any one anything (עָנָה Mi 6⁵, &c.; cf. in the other conjugations דָּבַר הַשִּׁיב prop. *verbum reddere*, with an accusative of the person, 1 K 12⁶, &c., also in the sense of announcing; sometimes also הִגִּיד to declare something to some one, Jb 26⁴, &c., for (הִגִּיד לְ) צָוָה to enjoin a person something, Ex 34³², Dt 1¹⁸, 32⁴⁶, Jer 7²³.

(δ) Expressions which mean to make, to form, to build something out of something; in such cases, besides the accusative of the object proper, another accusative is used for the material of which the thing is made, e.g. Gn 27 *וַיַּצֵּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם עָפָר מִן-הָאָרֶץ* and the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground; so with יָצַר also in 1 K 7¹⁵; further Ex 38⁸ *כָּל-כֵּלָיו עָשָׂה נְחָשֶׁת* all the vessels thereof made he of brass (for another explanation of the accusative *נְחָשֶׁת* [into brass], linguistically possible but excluded by the context, see below, ii with *kk*); cf. Ex 25^{18,23}, 26^{1,14 f,23}, 27¹, 36⁸, 1 K 7²⁷; with a preceding accusative of the material, Ex 25²⁹, 29², Dt 27⁶ *אֲבָנִים שְׁלֵמוֹת תִּבְנֶה אֶת-מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה* of unhewn stones shalt thou build the altar of the Lord.

(e) Verbs which express making, preparing, forming into anything, *ii* along with the object proper, take a second accusative of the product, e.g. Gn 27⁹ *וְאֶעֱשֶׂה אֹתָם מִטְעָמִים* I will make them (the kids) into savoury meat; cf. Gn 6^{14,16}, Ex 26^{1b}, 30²⁵, 32⁴, Is 44¹⁵, Ho 8⁴, 1 K 18³² *וַיִּבְנֶה מִזְבֵּחַ אֶת-הָאֲבָנִים מִזֶּפֶת* and he built the stones (into) an altar; cf. 10¹². So also אָפָה, with two accusatives, to bake something into something, Ex 12³⁹, Lv 24⁵; שָׂם (prop. to set up for something, cf. Gn 27³⁷, 28¹⁸, ψ 39⁹, and similarly הָרִים Gn 31⁴⁵) to change into something, Jos 8²⁸, Is 50², 51¹⁰, Mi 1⁷, 4¹³; with two accusatives of the person (to appoint, promote any one to the position of a . . .), Is 3⁷; נָתַן is also used in the same sense with two accusatives, Gn 17⁵, and שִׁית 1 K 11³⁴; as a rule, however, the description of the office, and also frequently of the product, is introduced by לְ to, § 119 *t*; also שִׂית to make a thing so and so (Is 5⁶, 26¹; with a personal object, ψ 21⁷, 19⁹); הִחְשִׁיךְ to make dark, Am 5⁸. Of the same class also are instances like Jb 28² *וַיִּקְרְעֶה שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר אֲבָן יָצִין נְחוּשָׁה* a stone they smelt into brass; 1 K 11³⁰ *וַיִּקְרְעֶה וַיִּתֵּן לְהַשְׁאִיט* and rent it (the garment) into twelve pieces; cf. Is 37²⁶, accusative of the product before the object proper, after לְהַשְׁאִיט to lay waste.

¹ Cf. a very pregnant expression of this kind in ψ 21¹⁸ *כִּי תִשְׂתַּמּוּ שֵׁכֶם* for thou shalt make them (as) a neck, i.e. thou shalt cause them to turn their necks (backs) to me; similarly ψ 18⁴¹ (2 S 22⁴¹, Ex 23²⁷); *וְנָתַתָּה לִּי עֶרְףְּ* thou hast given mine enemies unto me as a back; cf. Jer 18¹⁷.

On a second object with *verba sentiendi* (as יָדַע *to know* something *to be* something, Ec 7²⁵; רָאָה *to see, find to be*, Gn 7¹; חָשַׁב *to esteem* one *to be* something, Is 53⁴, elsewhere always construed with לְ or בְּ), cf. *h*.

kk Rem. At first sight some of the examples given above appear to be identical in character with those treated under *hh*; thus it is possible, e.g. in 1 K 18³², by a translation which equally suits the sense, *he built from the stones an altar*, to explain מִבְּנֵי as the nearer object and אֶת־הָאֲבָנִים as an accusative of the material, and the construction would then be exactly the same as in Dt 27⁶. In reality, however, the fundamental idea is by no means the same. Not that in the living language an accusative of the material in the one case, and in the other an accusative of the product were consciously distinguished. As Driver (*Tenses*, § 195) rightly observes, the remoter accusative in both cases is, strictly speaking, in apposition to the nearer. This is especially evident in such examples as Ex 20²⁵ *thou shalt not build them* (the stones of the altar) מִבְּנֵי as *hewn stones*, cf. also Gn 1²⁷. The main point is, which of the two accusatives, as being primarily affected (or aimed at) by the action, is to be made the more prominent; and on this point neither the position of the words (the nearer object, mostly determinate, as a rule follows immediately after the verb), nor even the context admits of much doubt. Thus in 1 K 18³² the treatment of the stones is the primary object in view, the erection of the altar for which they were intended is the secondary; in Dt 27⁶ the case is reversed.

ll (*d*) Finally, the second accusative sometimes more closely determines the nearer object by indicating the part or member specially affected by the action,¹ e.g. פָּסַח⁸ *for thou hast smitten all mine enemies* חֵמֶי (as to) *the cheek bone*, equivalent to *upon the cheek bone*; cf. Gn 37²¹ *let us not smite him* בְּחַיָּתוֹ in *the life*, i.e. let us not kill him; Dt 22²⁶, 2 S 3²⁷; also with שָׁוָה Gn 3¹⁵; with רָעָה Jer 2¹⁶; in poetry the object specially concerned is, by a bold construction, even placed first, Dt 33¹¹ (with חֲתָן).

§ 118. The Looser Subordination of the Accusative to the Verb.

a 1. The various forms of the looser subordination of a noun to the verb are distinguished from the different kinds of the accusative of the object (§ 117) by their specifying not the persons or things directly affected by the action, but some *more immediate circumstance* under which an action or an event takes place. Of such circumstances the most common are those of *place, time, measure, cause*, and finally the *manner* of performing the action. These nearer definitions are, as a rule, placed *after* the verb; they may, however, also precede it.

b Rem. That the cases thus loosely subordinated to the verb are to be regarded as *accusatives* is seen first from the fact that in certain instances the *nota accusativi* (אֶת) is prefixed; secondly from the fact that in one form of

¹ Analogous to this is the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ κατὰ μέρος in Greek epic poetry, e.g. ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγε ἕρκος ὀδόντων.

the *casus loci* a termination (הַ) is employed, in which (according to § 90 c) the old accusative ending is preserved; and finally from the consistency with which classical Arabic puts these nearer definitions in the accusative (which may be recognized by its form) even under circumstances in which one would be rather inclined to expect a nominative in apposition.

The relation subsisting between the circumstantial accusative and the accusative of the object is especially apparent when the former (as e.g. in a statement of the goal after a verb of motion) is immediately connected with its verb. But even the more loosely connected circumstantial definitions are certainly to be regarded as originally objects of a governing word habitually omitted, only that the consciousness of this closer government was at length lost, and the accusative more and more acquired an independent value as a *casus adverbialis*.

2. The accusative serves to define more precisely the *place* (*accus. d loci*), either (a) in answer to the question *whither?* after verbs of motion,¹ or (b) in answer to the question *where?* after verbs of *being, dwelling, resting, &c.* (but also after transitive verbs, see the examples), or finally (c) to define more precisely the *extent* in space, in answer to the question *how far? how high? how much?, &c.*

Instead of the simple accusative, the locative (see above, § 90 c)² is frequently found in the cases mentioned under *f* (sometimes also in those under *g*) or the preposition אֶל-³ especially before persons as the aim of the movement, or בְּ, usually, to express being at a place.

Examples of (a): נֵצַח הַשָּׂדֶה let us go out into the field, 1 S 20¹¹; cf. Gn 27³, 31⁴, Jb 29⁷; לָלֶכֶת תַּרְשִׁישׁ to go to Tarshish, 2 Ch 20³⁶; cf. Gn 10¹¹, 13⁹, 24²⁷, 26²³, 31²¹, Ex 4⁹, 17¹⁰, Ju 1²⁶, 2 K 11¹⁹, Na 1⁸ (?), ψ 134²; with לָקַח Nu 23¹⁴; with נָתַן Jos 6²⁴; with the *accus. loci* emphatically preceding (cf. Driver on 1 S 5⁸), 1 K 2²⁶, Is 25¹², Jer 2¹⁰, 20⁶, 32⁵; with בּוֹא (in the sense of *aggredi*, equivalent to בּוֹא עַל-^{על}, cf. § 117 a, note 2) the *personal aim* also is poetically added in the accusative, Ez 32¹¹, 38¹¹, Pr 10²⁴, 28²², Jb 15²¹, 20²²; but in the last passage it is better taken as an accusative of the object (cf. the German *einen ankommen, überkommen*). See also Nu 10³⁶ (where שָׁב can hardly be transitive); Ju 11²⁹, 1 S 13²⁰ (where, however, אֶל- has probably fallen out after יִשְׂרָאֵל; so Strack).—Finally, cf. also the use of אֲשֶׁר for שָׁמָּה . . . אֲשֶׁר *whither*, Nu 13²⁷.—The *accus. loci* occurs after a passive, e.g. Gn 12¹⁵.

Examples of (b): Gn 38¹¹ remain a widow בֵּית אָבִיךָ in thy father's house; cf. Gn 24²³, 1 S 17¹⁵, 2 S 2³², Is 3⁶, Hos 12⁵, Mi 6¹⁰, 2 Ch 33²⁰; פֶּתַח הָאֵהָל in the tent door, Gn 18^{1,10}, 19¹¹, and frequently. As observed by Driver on 1 S 2²⁹, accusatives of this kind are almost without exception (but cf. 1 K 8³², Is 16², 28⁷, 2 Ch 33²⁰) connected with a noun in the genitive. In all the above examples, however, the accusative may have been preferred to the natural construction with בְּ (which is not rare even with בֵּית and פֶּתַח) for euphonic reasons, in order to avoid the combination of such sounds as בְּבֵית and בְּפֶתַח; cf., moreover, Gn 2¹⁴, 4¹⁶, Ex 18⁵, Lv 6⁸ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ instead of the usual הַמִּזְבֵּחַ.

¹ So commonly in Sanskrit; in Greek only poetically, e.g. Iliad i. 317 κνίσθη δ' οὐρανὸν ἵκει: in Latin, e.g. *rus ire, Romam proficisci*.

² Hence e.g. in 1 S 9²⁶ the Masora requires הָהָנָה instead of the *Keth.* הָהָנָה.

³ So in Ju 19¹⁸ for אֶת-בֵּית יִ the better reading is אֶל-בֵּית.

Ex 29¹³, &c.); Dt 1^{2,19}, 2 S 17²⁶, 1 K 7⁸, Pr 8³, 9¹⁴. On Is 1³⁰ see § 116 i; on יָשַׁב, with the *accus. loci*, see § 117 bb. On the other hand, in Dt 6³, according to the LXX, a verb of *giving* has dropped out before אֶתְּנֶה.

h Examples of (c): Gn 7²⁰ *fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail*; Gn 31²³, 41⁴⁰ אֲנִי אֶדְבָּר מִפָּנֶיךָ רַק הַכֶּסֶף אֶדְבָּר only in the throne will I be greater than thou; Dt 1¹⁹ *we went (through) all that great and terrible wilderness*; cf. Jb 29³. Of the same kind also are such cases as Ex 16¹⁶ (according to the number of your persons, for which elsewhere לְמִסְפַּר is used); 1 S 6⁴ (with the *accus. preceding*); 6¹⁸, 2 S 21²⁰, Jb 1⁵.—A statement of weight is put in the accusative in 2 S 14²⁶.

i 3. The accusative is employed to determine more precisely the *time* (*accus. temporis*), (a) in answer to the question *when?* e.g. הַיּוֹם the day, i.e. *on the day* (in question), *at that time*, but also *on this day*, i.e. *to-day*, or finally *by day*, equivalent to יוֹמָם, like עֶרֶב at evening, לַיְלָה noctu, בֹּקֶר in the morning, early, ψ 5⁴, &c., צַהֲרָיִם at noonday, ψ 91⁶; יוֹם אֶחָד on one and the same day, Gn 27⁴⁵; שָׁנָא in sleep, ψ 127²; תְּחִלַּת קְצִיר שְׁעָרִים (Q̄rê 'Bṯ) at the beginning of barley harvest, 2 S 21⁹; in stating a date, Gn 11¹⁰, 14⁴ in the thirteenth year.

k (b) In answer to the question *how long?* e.g. Gn 3¹⁴, &c., כָּל-יְמֵי all the days of thy life; 7⁴ forty days and forty nights; 7²¹, 14⁴, 15¹³, 21³⁴, 29¹⁸, Ex 20⁹ (for six days); 23¹⁵, 31¹⁷; עוֹלָמִים for ever, 1 K 8¹³; also with the accusative made determinate, Ex 13⁷ יַת שְׁבַעַת הַיָּמִים throughout the seven days in question, mentioned immediately before; cf. Ju 14¹⁷, Dt 9²⁵.

l 4. The accusative is sometimes used of abstract ideas to state the reason (*accus. causae*), e.g. Is 7²⁵ thou shalt not come thither יִרְאַת שְׁמִיר for fear of briars.

m 5. Finally the accusative is used very variously (as an *accus. adverbialis* in the narrower sense), in order to describe more precisely the *manner* in which an action or state takes place. In English such accusatives are mostly rendered by *in*, *with*, *as*, *in the form or manner of* . . . , *according to*, *in relation to*, *with regard to*. For more convenient classification we may distinguish them as—

n (a) Adjectives expressing *state*, placed after the verb to describe more accurately some bodily or other external condition, e.g. Is 20² walking עָרֹם וְיָחָף naked and barefoot; cf. verse 3, 8²¹, Gn 15², 33¹⁸ (שָׁלֵם), Ju 8⁴, Mi 1⁸, ψ 107⁵ (but in 15² תָּמִים is rather a substantive directly dependent on הוֹלֵךְ = he that walketh in uprightness; cf. § 117 r, note); Jb 30²³. After an accusative, e.g. Dt 15¹⁸; to specify some mental state, e.g. Gn 37³⁵ (אֲדָבֵל).—Before the verb (and then with a certain emphasis), Am 2¹⁶, Jb 1²¹, Ec 5¹⁴; Lv 20²⁰, Jb 19²⁵, 27¹⁹, 31²⁶

1 In ψ 12¹² דֶּרֶךְ is not to be taken as an *accus. loci* (on the way), but as an *accus. of respect* (with regard to the way); see below, m.

(unless יקר be a substantive); Ru 1²¹ (מִלְאָה parallel with the adverb רִיקָם).

In Mi 2⁷ the text is clearly corrupt.

Those examples are especially instructive in which the adjective expressing a state, although referring to several, is nevertheless used in the singular, e.g. Jb 24¹⁰ עָרוֹם הֵלְכוּ naked, i.e. in the condition of one naked, they go about; cf. verse 7 and 12¹⁷. In Is 20⁴ the singular occurs after a plural object, and in Is 47⁵ the masc. after the 2nd sing. fem. imperative, which clearly proves that the term expressing the state is not conceived as being in apposition, but as an indeclinable adverb.

(b) Participles, again either after the verb, Nu 16²⁷, Jer 2²⁷, 43², ψ 7⁵, Jb 24⁵, p Ct 2⁸, or before it, Gn 49¹¹, Is 57¹⁹, Ez 36³⁵, ψ 56², 92¹⁴, Pr 20¹⁴; cf. also the substantival use of the participles נִרְאָהוּ in a fearful manner (ψ 139¹⁴) and נִפְלְאוּ in a wonderful manner, Jb 37⁵, Dn 8²⁴.—Also participles in connexion with genitives, as מִתְהַלֵּךְ Gn 3⁸ (cf. also בָּאָה 1 K 14⁶), are to be regarded as expressing a state and not as being in apposition, since in the latter case they would have to take the article.—In 2 S 13²⁰, 1 K 7⁷ and Hb 2¹⁰ the explicative Wāw (equivalent to and that too) is also prefixed to the participle. In ψ 69⁴ for מִיַּחַל read מִיַּחַל.—On 1 K 11⁸, 2 K 10⁶, 19², Hag 1⁴, cf. the note on § 131 h.

(c) Substantives¹ in the most varied relations: thus, as describing an external state, e.g. Mi 2³ וְלֹא תֵלְכוּ רוּמָה neither shall ye walk haughtily (as opposed to שָׁחוֹת Is 60¹⁴); Lv 6⁹ (accus. before the verb = as unleavened cakes), Dt 2⁹, 4¹¹, Ju 5²¹, Is 57², Pr 7¹⁰, Jb 31²⁶, La 1⁹; as stating the position of a disease, 1 K 15²³ he was diseased אֶת־רַגְלָיו in his feet (2 Ch 16¹² בְּרַגְלָיו), analogous to the cases discussed in § 117 l and § 121 d (d); as describing a spiritual, mental, or moral state, e.g. Nu 32¹⁴, Jos 9² אֶחָד פִּה with one accord, 1 K 22¹³; cf. Ex 24³, Zp 3⁹, 1 S 15³², 2 S 23³, Is 41³ (unless שָׁלוֹם is adjectival, and the passage is to be explained as in n); Jer 31⁷, Ho 12¹⁵, 14⁵, ψ 56³, 58², 75³, Pr 31⁹, Jb 16⁹, La 1⁹; Lv 19¹⁶, &c., in the expression הָלַךְ רָכִיל to go up and down as a tale-bearer; also בְּטִיחָה unawares, Gn 34²⁶, Ez 30⁹; מִישְׁרִים uprightly, ψ 58², 75³ (in both places before the verb); as stating the age, e.g. 1 S 2³³ (if the text be right) מָוְתוֹ אֲנָשִׁים they shall die as men, i.e. in the prime of life; cf. 1 S 2¹⁸ (נָעַר), Is 65²⁰, and Gn 15¹⁶; as specifying a number more accurately, Dt 4²⁷, 1 S 13¹⁷, 2 K 5², Jer 31⁸ [in Jer 13¹⁹ שְׁלוֹמִים wholly (?) is corrupt; read שְׁלֵמָה נְלִיָּת with LXX for הִנְלִיָּת]; as stating the consequence of the action, Lv 15¹³, &c.

The description of the external or internal state may follow, in poetry, in the form of a comparison with some well-known class, e.g. Is 21⁸ וַיִּקְרָא אֲרִיָּה and he cried as a lion; cf. ψ 22¹⁴, Is 22¹⁸ (כְּדֹרִי like a ball); Is 24²², Zc 2⁸, ψ 11¹ (unless יַצְפֹּר be vocative); 58^{9b} (unless the force of the preceding בְּ is carried on, as in ψ 90⁴); ψ 144¹², Jb 24⁵ פְּרָאִים, before the verb); 41⁷ shut up together as with a close seal.²

6. To the expressions describing a state belong finally those nouns s which are introduced by the comparative particle בְּ,³ since the בְּ is to

¹ Cf. above, § 100 c, on certain substantives which have completely become adverbs; and § 113 h and k on the adverbial use of the infinitive absolute.

² It is, as a matter of fact, permissible to speak of the above examples as *comparatio decurtata*, but it must not be assumed that the comparative particle בְּ, which is otherwise regularly prefixed (see s), has actually dropped out.

³ On the use of בְּ as a prefix, cf. § 102 c.

be regarded as originally a substantive¹ in the sense of *amount, kind* (*instar*), standing in the accusative (so that כִּי is equivalent to *as a kind of, after the manner of, according to*), while the following noun represents a genitive governed by the כִּי . From this, which is the proper meaning of the כִּי , may be explained its power of representing a great many pregnant relations, which in English can only be rendered by the help of prepositions.² Thus the comparison may refer to—

- t* (a) The place, e.g. Is. 5¹⁷ כִּדְבָרָם *after the manner of*, i. e. as in their pasture; 23¹⁵ as (it is said) in the song of the harlot; 28²¹, 29⁷ כַּחֲלוֹם as in a dream.
- u* (b) The time, especially in the combination כִּיּוֹם *after the manner of the day*, equivalent to *as in the day*, Is 9³, Ho 2⁵; כִּימֵי as in the days of . . ., Is 51⁹, Ho 2¹⁷, 9⁹, 12¹⁰, Am 9¹¹; cf. moreover, Lv 22¹³, Ju 20³⁹, Is 17⁶, Jb 5¹⁴, 29⁹, and the expressions כִּיּוֹם כִּיּוֹם as day by day = as in the former days, 1 S 18¹⁰; $\text{כַּפְּעַם כַּפְּעַם}$ as at other times, 1 S 3¹⁰, &c.; $\text{כִּשְׁנָה כִּשְׁנָה}$ as in former years, 2 K 17⁴; cf. § 123 c. Of a different character is the use of כִּי as a simple particle of time, e.g. Gn 18¹⁰ כֵּעַת הַיָּה at this time (not about the time), when it lives again, i. e. at the end of a year; כֵּעַת מָחָר to-morrow at this time; cf. Is 23⁵, and the frequent connexion of כִּי with the infinitive construct to express a definite time (in the sense of a pluperfect), Gn 12¹⁴, 27³⁴, Ex 9²⁹, &c.
- u* (c) The person, e.g. Gn 34³¹ should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?
- w* (d) The thing, e.g. Is 10¹⁴, ψ 33⁷, Jb 28⁵ כִּמוֹ-אֵשׁ as a fire, i. e. as it were by fire (cf. Is 1²⁵ כִּבְר as with lye); Jb 29²³ כִּמְטָר as for the rain (they waited for me); Jb 38¹⁴ (as in a garment); 38³⁰ כִּפְאֵבָן as to stone (the waters are solidified in freezing).
- x* Rem. According to the earlier grammarians, כִּי is sometimes used pleonastically, i. e. not to indicate a similarity (as in Lv 14³⁵ as it were, i. e. something like), but simply to introduce the predicate (*Kaph veritatis*), e.g. Neh 7² for he was כִּאִישׁ אֱמֶת a faithful man; cf. 1 S 20⁸ כַּפְּשָׁע , La 1²⁰ כַּמּוֹת . Such a pleonasm is of course out of the question. At the most a *Kaph veritatis* can only be admitted in the sense that the comparison is sometimes introduced by כִּי with a certain emphasis (equivalent to *in every respect like*); thus כִּאִישׁ אֱמֶת in Neh 7² means simply of the nature of a faithful man, i. e. as only a faithful man can be; cf. Nu 11¹, Is 1⁷, 13⁶, Ho 4⁴, 5¹⁰, Ob 1¹, Jb 24¹⁴, 27⁷, La 1²⁰, 2⁴; also כַּמְעַט in such passages as ψ 105¹² *yea, very few*; but e.g. in Is 1⁹ *only just, a very small . . .*

¹ Schwabe (כִּי nach seinem Wesen und Gebrauch im alttestam. Kanon gewürdigt, Halle, 1883) contests this explanation (which is defended especially by Fleischer and is certainly indisputable). He, with Gesenius and Ewald, places כִּי as a preposition on the same footing as כֶּן and כֵּן , and believes it to be probably connected with the stem כִּנָּן as well as with כִּי and כֵּן . The above view of כִּי as a substantive of course does not imply that the language as we have it is still in every case conscious of the substantival meaning.—On כִּי in numerical statements, in the sense of *about, nearly*, see the Lexicon.

² It would be altogether unsuitable here also (see above, note 2 on *r*) to assume a loss of the preposition. Such examples as Is 1²⁶ כִּבְרָאֲשָׁנָה and כִּבְרָתְחָלָה , Lv 26⁸⁷ (כִּמְעַנִּי) are to be explained from the fact that here the

§ 119. *The Subordination of Nouns to the Verb by means of Prepositions.*

1. In general. As is the case with regard to the looser subordination of nouns to the verbal idea (§ 118), so also their subordination by means of prepositions is used to represent the more immediate circumstances (of place, time, cause, purpose, measure, association, or separation) under which an action or event is accomplished. In the case of most prepositions some idea of a relation of *space* underlies the construction, which then, in a wider sense, is extended to the ideas of time, motive, or other relations conceived by the mind.

On the origin of the prepositions and the original case-relation in which they stand to the nouns governed by them, cf. § 101, where a list of the prepositions is given with their original meanings. Cf. also § 102 on the prefixes, and § 103 on the union of prepositions with suffixes.

2. A not unimportant part is played in Hebrew by the *compounding* of prepositions to represent more accurately the relations of place, which either precede or follow the action. In the former case *מִן*, and in the latter (which is not so frequent) *אַחֲרֵי* occurs before other prepositions of place; cf. e.g. Am 7¹⁵ *the Lord took me מֵאַחֲרֵי הַצֹּאן from behind the flock*; 2 K 9¹⁸ *turn thee אַחֲרַי to behind me, i.e. turn thee behind me*; מֵעַם, *מֵאַחַד מֵעַם from being with . . .*, as in French *de chez, d'après quelqu'un*.¹ For further examples, see c.

Rem. 1. We must not regard as combined prepositions in the above sense C either those *substantives* which have become prepositions only by their union with prefixes, as *לְפָנַי* before, *מִפְּנֵי*, *לְמַעַן* on account of (but e.g. *מִלְפָּנַי* from before, Gn 4¹⁶, &c., is such a compound); nor *adverbs*, which are also formed by combining words which were originally substantives (also used as prepositions) with prepositions, as *מִחוּץ* without, *מִתַּחַת* in the sense of below,² *מֵעַל* preposition and substantive had already become simply one word before the *כִּי* was prefixed. We find also *כֵּעֵל* Is 59¹⁸, 63⁷, *כִּי* 119¹⁴, and 2 Ch 32¹⁹; cf. Driver on 1 S 14¹⁴ (*כִּי-כַחַצִּי*), where the text is wholly corrupt.

¹ In other cases French, as well as English and German, can only emphasize one of the two combined ideas; thus, such expressions as *il prend le chapeau sur la table*, German and English *er nimmt den Hut vom Tisch*, he takes his hat from the table, all regard the action from one point of view only; the Hebrew here brings out both aspects of it by means of *מֵעַל* from upon, cf. e.g. Is 6⁶.

² Hence not to be confounded with *מִתַּחַת* from under, in such examples as Pr 22²⁷, which is a real compound preposition. In the above-mentioned adverbs also the *מִן* was originally by no means pleonastic; *מִתַּחַת* denotes properly the locality, regarded primarily as a place from beneath which something proceeds, and so on. This original sense of the *מִן*, however, has become so much obscured by its regular combination with words of place to form independent adverbs, that it is even prefixed (evidently only on the analogy of such common adverbs as *מֵעַל*, *מִתַּחַת*) in cases where it is really inadmissible, owing to the meaning of the adverb, e.g. in *מִלְבָּד*, *מִבְּלָעַד*

above (so also in Gn 27³⁹, 49²⁵, not from above). These adverbs of place, however, may become prepositions by the addition of ל, e.g. ל מחוץ outside as regards . . . , i.e. outside of something, in 1 K 21¹³ even after a transitive verb of motion; ער-מתחת ל below as regards . . . , i.e. under something (cf. ער-מתחת ל until they came under . . . , 1 S 11¹¹), מעל ל over something, &c.; לבר prop. in separation; לבר מן in separation from, i.e. apart from, besides. Only rarely in such a case is the ל omitted for the sake of brevity, e.g. Jb 26⁵ מתחת מים beneath the waters; Neh 3²⁸ (מעל).

d 2. Real combinations of prepositions (each retaining its full force) occur—
(a) With מן, in מאחרי, מאחרי (see above) from behind something; מאת and מעם from with (see above); מבין or מבינות from between something (with motion in either direction, see e.g. Gn 49¹⁰); מלפני from before (see above); sometimes also מכול Lv 5⁸, &c.; מעל from upon, i.e. off from; מתחת away from under (see footnote 2 on p. 377).

e (b) With אל-אחרי, אל-אחרי to behind, אל-בינות to between; אל-מבית ל forth between 2 K 11¹⁵; אל-מחוץ ל forth without, i.e. out in front of, Nu 5³; אל-תחת down under.¹—In Jb 5⁵ the two prepositions of motion are combined in a peculiarly pregnant construction, אל-מצנים (he goes thither and takes it) out of the thorns, i.e. he taketh it even out of the thorns, but the text is hardly correct.

f 3. A general view of the union of certain verbs, or whole classes of verbs, with particular prepositions, especially in explanation of certain idioms and pregnant expressions.²

g (a) אל- (אלי)³ towards, properly an expression of motion or at least direction towards something (either in the sense of up to = עד, or into = אל-תוך), is used after verbs not only in answer to the question whither? but by a specially pregnant construction, in answer to the question where? e.g. Jer 41¹² they

without, cf. also such examples as משם, מן, מן, מן (there), &c. Since a מן is not usually repeated after מלבר, it appears as if מלבר by a transposition of the מן stood for the usual לבר מן. In reality, however, the preposition which forms the adverb into a preposition is omitted here, as in מעל, מתחת, without a following ל (see above). Properly מלבר has a purely adverbial meaning = taken by itself, like מלמעלה מן (Syriac men le'el) above (adv.), as distinguished from מעל ל or מעל-ל (Syriac le'el men), over, upon something.—Also למן from . . . onward is not for מן-ל, but the ל serves merely (just like the Latin usque in usque a, usque ad, usque ex) to indicate expressly the starting-point, as an exact terminus a quo (of place or time).

¹ Also in 1 S 21⁵ אל-תחת by a pregnant construction is virtually dependent on the idea of coming into, contained in the preceding אין.

² A summary of all the relations and senses in which a preposition may be used, belongs not to the Grammar but to the Lexicon.

³ Cf. Mitchell, 'The preposition el,' in the Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1888, p. 143 ff., and especially A. Noordtjiz, Het hebreuwsche voorzetsel אל, Leiden, 1896, a thorough examination of its uses, and especially of the relation between אל- and על-.

found him *אֶל-מַיִם רַבִּים* by the great waters; cf. Dt 16⁶, 1 K 13²⁰, and a still more remarkable instance in 8³⁰ *אֶל-מְקוֹם שֶׁבָּחָהּ אֱלֹהֵי-הַשָּׁמַיִם*. This combination of two different ideas, of motion to a place and being or acting in the place (very plainly seen in Dt 16⁶ but to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose... shalt thou bring thine offering and there shalt thou sacrifice, &c.), is the same as the Greek use of *eis*, *es* for *en*, the Latin *in potestatem, in amicitiam ditionemque esse, manere* (Cic. Verr. 5, 38; Div. 2, 14, &c.); cf. also the common German expressions *zu Hause, zu Leipzig sein, zu Bette liegen, &c.*

(b) *בְּ*¹ Underlying the very various uses of this preposition is either the *h* idea of being or moving within some definite region, or some sphere of space or time (with the infinitive, a simultaneous action, &c.), or else the idea of fastening on something, close connexion with something (also in a metaphorical sense, following some kind of pattern, e.g. the advice or command of some one *בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדַמּוֹתֵנוּ* in Gn 1²⁶ *בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדַמּוֹתֵנוּ* in our image, after our likeness; cf. 1²⁷, 5^{1.3}), or finally the idea of relying or depending upon... or even of merely striking or touching something.

Thus the use of *בְּ* is explained— *i*

(1) In the sense of *among* (in the domain of), e.g. Mi 7² *לֹא יֵשֵׁר בְּאָדָם אִיִּן* there is none upright among men; in the sense of *consisting of*, in specifying the constituents of a collective idea, e.g. Gn 7²¹ *וְכָל בָּשָׂר מוֹת* and all flesh died... in (=consisting of) fowl, &c. 8¹⁷, 9¹⁰, Ho 4³. Also after ideas of appearing, manifesting oneself, representing, being, in the sense of *as*, in the capacity of (prop. in the sphere, after the manner of, see above), *consisting of*..., *tanquam*, the *essentiae* of the earlier grammarians, corresponding to the Greek *en*, the Latin *in*,² and the French *en*, e.g. Ex 6³ *וַיֵּרָא אֶל-אַבְרָהָם* I appeared unto Abraham... *בְּאֵל שַׁדַּי* as *El Shaddai*; Jb 23¹³ *וְהוּא בְּאֶחָד* but he is (manifests himself as) one, i.e. he remains always the same; Dt 26⁵, 28⁶² *בְּמַחֲי מַעַט* in the condition of being few, cf. 10²² to the number of seventy; Is 40¹⁰, *פֶּשַׁע* 39⁷.—Cf. also such examples as Ex 18⁴ (*פֶּשַׁע* 35², 146⁵) *בְּעֻזִּי* as my help; Dt 26¹⁴ *בְּעֻזִּי* being unclean; Is 28¹⁶ *בְּעֻזִּי* in Sion (i.e. I make Sion a foundation); Ez 20⁴¹ *בְּעֻזִּי* as a sweet savour; Pr 3²⁶, perhaps also Ex 3² *בְּעֻזִּי* in (i.e. as) a flame of fire; Is 66¹⁵ *בְּעֻזִּי* with (i.e. like) fire; *פֶּשַׁע* 31²³, 37²⁰ (102⁴). For the origin of all these forms of expression *פֶּשַׁע* 54⁶ is especially instructive, since *בְּעֻזִּי* is not meant to refer to the Lord as belonging to the *סְמִיכִים*, but only to ascribe to him a similar character, i.e. the Lord is one who upholds my soul; so also *פֶּשַׁע* 99⁶, 118⁷, Ju 11³⁶ [the plur. as in *פֶּשַׁע* 124 *g-i*].³—Cf. Gesenius, *Thes. Linguae Hebr.*, i. 174 f., and Delitzsch on *פֶּשַׁע* 35².

(2) To introduce the object after transitive verbs, which denote touching, *k* striking, reaching to (thus to some extent a fastening on, see above) something, in English sometimes rendered by *al*, *on*, &c., and in German generally by compounds with *an*, e.g. *anfassen* = *בְּ* *אָחַז*, *anrühren* = *בְּ* *נָגַע*, &c. To the same category belongs also the construction of verbs denoting authority (*מִשַׁל*, *מָלַךְ*, *נָגַשׁ*, *רָדָה*, the last prop. to tread on...) with *בְּ*, inasmuch as the exercise of the authority is regarded as a laying hold of the person ruled; so also, the introduction of the object by *בְּ* after certain *verba dicendi*, or when the mental action is to be represented as extending to some one or something: e.g.

¹ Cf. Wandel, *De particulae Hebr. בְּ indole, vi, usu*, Jena, 1875.

² e.g. *res in praeda captae*, i.e. things taken as spoil; see Nägelsbach, *Lat. Stilistik*, § 123⁴. On the Hebrew *בְּ* *essentiae*, see Hauschild in the *Festschrift zur Einweihung des Goethegymn.* Frankf. a. M. 1897, p. 163.

³ Other instances formerly cited here (Is 26⁴, *פֶּשַׁע* 55¹⁹, where *בְּ* is used before the subject) as well as *פֶּשַׁע* 68⁵ *בְּיָהּ שֵׁמוֹ* *Jah* is his name, are textually very uncertain. Cf. Cheyne, *SBOT. Isaiah*, p. 173, on Is 26⁴.

כָּרָא $\bar{\text{ב}}$ to call on some one, $\bar{\text{ב}}$ נִשְׁבַּע $\bar{\text{ב}}$ iurare per aliquem, $\bar{\text{ב}}$ שָׁאַל to enquire of some one. Again, $\bar{\text{ב}}$ רָאָה to look upon, $\bar{\text{ב}}$ שָׁמַע to hearken to (but cf. also מ), generally with the secondary idea of participation, or of the pleasure with which one sees or hears anything, especially pleasure at the misfortunes of others, hence $\bar{\text{ב}}$ רָאָה to see his desire on any one or anything; cf. however, Gn 21¹⁶ let me not look upon the death of the child; 1 S 6¹⁹ because they had looked [irreverently] at the ark of the Lord.

Closely related to this is the use of $\bar{\text{ב}}$:

- l** (3) To introduce the person or thing, which is the object of a mental act, e.g. $\bar{\text{ב}}$ הֶאֱמִין to trust in (to cleave trustingly to) somebody or something; $\bar{\text{ב}}$ בָּטַח to have confidence in . . . ; $\bar{\text{ב}}$ שָׂמַח to rejoice in or at something, &c.; $\bar{\text{ב}}$ דִּבֶּר to speak of (about) some one or something, Dt 6⁷, 1 S 19^{8 f.}, &c.
- m** (4) The idea of an action as extending to something, with at the same time the secondary idea of participation in something, underlies finally the partitive use of $\bar{\text{ב}}$, e.g. $\bar{\text{ב}}$ אָכַל to share in eating something, Ex 12^{43 ff.}, Lv 22¹¹; also simply to eat, to taste of something, Ju 13¹⁶, Jb 21²⁶; so also $\bar{\text{ב}}$ לָחַם to eat of, and $\bar{\text{ב}}$ שָׁתָה¹ to drink of something, Pr 9⁵; $\bar{\text{ב}}$ שָׁמַע to hear a whisper of something, Jb 26¹⁴; $\bar{\text{ב}}$ מָצָא they found remaining of her only. . . , 2 K 9³⁵; $\bar{\text{ב}}$ נָשָׂא to bear a share of something, Nu 11¹⁷, Ez 18²⁰, Jb 7¹³. Cf. also $\bar{\text{ב}}$ חָלַק to give a share of something, Jb 39¹⁷; $\bar{\text{ב}}$ בָּנָה to do building to, Neh 4⁴.
- n** (5) With the idea of touching, striking against anything is naturally connected that of proximity and vicinity near, and further that of association with something; cf. Gn 9⁴ בִּנְפִשׁוֹ with the life thereof; 15¹⁴, 32¹¹ בְּמִקְלִי with my staff. Sometimes $\bar{\text{ב}}$ combined with a verb of motion (to come with something), expresses the idea of bringing, e.g. Ju 15¹ Samson visited his wife with a kid, i.e. he brought her a kid; Dt 23⁵, ψ 66¹³, 1 Ch 15^{19 ff.}, 16⁶.
- o** (6) From the idea of connexion with something, being accompanied by something (see n), is developed, finally, the instrumental use of $\bar{\text{ב}}$, which represents the means or instrument (or even the personal agent), as something with which one has associated himself in order to perform an action; cf. Mi 4¹⁴ בַּשֶּׁבֶט they smite with the rod; Is 10²⁴; ψ 18⁸⁰ בְּךָ by thee (so also 44⁶, parallel with בְּשִׁמְךָ; Is 10³⁴, Ho 1⁷, 12¹⁴; cf. also $\bar{\text{ב}}$ עָבַד to labour by means of some one, i.e. to cause him to labour at it, Ex 1¹⁴, &c. On $\bar{\text{ב}}$ with the passive to introduce the means or the author, see § 121 f.
- p** A variety of the $\bar{\text{ב}}$ instrumenti is $\bar{\text{ב}}$ pretii (the price being considered as the means of acquiring a thing), cf. Gn 23⁹, 29¹⁸ (בְּרִחָל); 30¹⁶, 33¹⁹, 34¹⁵ (בְּזֹאת on this condition); 37²⁸; also, in a wider sense, Gn 18²⁸ $\bar{\text{ב}}$ for the sake of; 1 S 3¹³.
- q** Rem. The use of $\bar{\text{ב}}$ instrumenti to introduce the object is peculiar in such expressions as ψ 44²⁰ and thou coveredst over us בְּצִלְמָוֹת with the shadow of death; Jb 16¹⁰ פָּעְרוּ עָלַי בְּפִיהֶם they have opened wide their mouth against me (prop. have made an opening with their mouth); cp. ψ 22⁸, Ex 7²⁰ he lifted up בַּמֶּטֶה the rod; Lv 16⁴ חָנָר and צִנָּה followed by $\bar{\text{ב}}$; Jos 8¹⁸, La 1¹⁷. Analogous to some English expressions we find both to gnash the teeth, ψ 35¹⁶, and to gnash with the teeth, Jb 16⁹; to wink the eye, Pr 10¹⁰, and to wink with the eye, Pr 6¹³; shake the head, ψ 22⁸, and to shake with the head, Jer 18¹⁶, Jb 16⁴.—In all these instances

¹ To be distinguished from $\bar{\text{ב}}$ שָׁתָה = to drink from (a cup, &c., Gn 44⁵, Am 6⁶), as in Arabic and Aramaic (Dn 5²). Cf. also $\epsilon\nu$ ποτηρίοις (Xen. Anab. vi. 1, 4), $\epsilon\nu$ χρυσώμασι πίνειν (3 Ezr 3⁶), venenum in auro bibitur, Seneca, Thyestes 453, and the French boire dans une tasse.

the verb (intransitive) construed with לִּי has a greater independence, and consequently more emphasis than the verb construed with a direct accusative; the latter conveys a sort of necessary specification of the action, while the noun introduced by לִּי is used rather as a merely adverbial complement.

An instructive example of this is נָתַן קוֹל *vocem emittere*, to utter a voice, also to thunder, while in נָתַן בְּקוֹלוֹ ψ 46⁷ (68⁸⁴, Jer 12⁸), נָתַן has an independent sense = *he thundered with his voice* (i.e. mightily).

(c) לִּי ¹ to, a very general expression of direction towards anything, is used to represent the most varied relations of an action or state with regard to a person or thing. On the use of לִּי as a periphrasis for the *genetivus possessoris* or *auctoris* (the idea of belonging to), see § 129; on לִּי with the passive, to introduce the author or the cause, see § 121 f; on לִּי in a purely local sense (e.g. לְיָמִינֶךָ at thy right hand, prop. towards thy right hand), or temporal (e.g. לְעֶרֶב at evening, &c.) or distributive, see the Lexicon.

The following uses of לִּי properly belong to the government of the verb :

- (1) As a *nota dativi*² to introduce the remoter object; also S
- (2) To introduce the *dativus commodi*. This *dativus commodi* (or *incommodi*, e.g. Ez 37¹¹) is used—especially in colloquial language and in later style—in the form of a pronoun with לִּי , as an apparently pleonastic *dativus ethicus*, with many verbs, in order to give emphasis to the significance of the occurrence in question for a particular subject. In this construction the person of the pronoun must always agree with that of the verbal form.³ By far the most frequent use of this לִּי is with the pronoun of the 2nd person after imperatives, e.g. לֵךְ-לֵךְ go, get thee away, Gn 1 1, 22², Dt 2¹³ (also in the feminine, Ct 2^{10.13}); $\text{לֵךְ וְנָתַתְּ אֹרֶךְ}$ turn thee aside, 2 S 22¹; $\text{לָקֶחְךָ$ take your journey, Dt 1⁷; עָבְרוּ לָכֶם pass ye over; בָּרַח-לָךְ flee (to save thyself), Gn 27⁴³; עֲלִי-לָךְ get thee up, Is 40⁹; $\text{לָכֶם וְהָנִיתִי$ turn you, Dt 1⁴⁰; $\text{לָכֶם וְשׁוּבוּ$ return ye, Dt 5²⁷; קוּמִי לָךְ rise up, Ct 2¹⁰; $\text{לָכֶם וְשָׁבוּ$ abide ye, Gn 22⁵; לָךְ חָרַל forbear thee, 2 Ch 35²¹ (in the plural, Is 22²); $\text{לָכֶם וְהָבִי$ take you, Dt 1¹³, Jos 18⁴, Ju 20⁷, 2 S 16²⁰, and so almost regularly לָךְ הִשְׁמָר (see above, § 51 n) *cave tibi!* and הִשְׁמָרוּ לָכֶם take heed to yourselves; לָךְ דִּמָּה לִּי be thou like, Ct 2¹⁷ (cf. verse 9), 8¹⁴, is remarkable; after a perfect consecutive, 1 K 17³, 1 S 22⁵; after an imperfect consecutive, e.g. Is 36⁹ $\text{לָךְ וְהִבְטַחְתִּי}$ and puttest thy trust.—In the 3rd person, e.g. וַיֹּשֶׁב לָהּ and sat her down, Gn 21¹⁶, cf. 22⁵, Ex 18²⁷, ψ 120⁶, 123⁴, Jb 6¹⁹; even after a participle, Ho 8⁹.—In the 1st person plural, Ez 37¹¹.
- (3) To introduce the result after verbs of making, forming, changing, *t* appointing to something, esteeming as something; in short, in all those cases in which, according to § 117 ii, a second *accusative* may also be used.
- (4) In loose connexion with some verbal idea in the sense of *in reference to*, *u* with regard to ... (§ 143 e); so after a *verbum dicendi*, Gn 20¹³; 1 K 10²³, cf.

¹ Cf. Giesebrecht, *Die hebr. Präpos. Lamed*, Halle, 1876.

² Just as in the Romance languages the Latin preposition *ad* (Italian *a*, before vowels *à*, French *à*, Spanish *á*) and in English *to* are used as a periphrasis for the dative.—On the introduction of the nearer object by לִּי , cf. § 117 n.

³ Such expressions as the analogous English *he plucked me ope his doublet, but me no buts*, and the like, are accordingly inadmissible in Hebrew.

Is 36⁹; even before the verb, Jer 9².—To the same class belongs also the *Lamedh inscriptionis* (untranslatable in English, and hardly more than a mere quotation-mark) which introduces the exact wording of an inscription or title; thus Is 8¹ *write upon it* . . . (the words) מִהֵר נִשְׁלַל וְגו' (cf. verse 3, where the ל naturally is not used); Ez 37¹⁶.

- ו (ā) מִן, originally (according to § 101 a) *separation*,¹ represents both the idea of *distance, separation or remoteness from something*, and that of *motion away from something*, hence also *descent, origin from a place*, Am 1¹.
- ז (i) From the idea of *separation* is naturally derived on the one hand the sense of (taken) *from among* . . . , e. g. Gn 3¹ *subtil as none other of the beasts*, &c.; cf. 3¹⁴, Dt 33²⁴, 1 S 15³³, Ju 5²⁴ (so especially after the idea of choosing out of² a larger class, 1 S 22⁸; cf. Ex 19⁵, &c.), and on the other hand, the sense of *without* (separated, free from . . .), e. g. Is 22³ מִקֶּשֶׁת אֶפְרוֹ without the bow (i. e. without one needing to bend a bow against them) *they were made prisoners*; cf. Jer 48⁴⁵ מִכֹּחַ without strength; Ho 6⁶, as the first half-verse shows, *not more than burnt offerings* (as R. V.), but *and not burnt offerings*; Mi 3⁶, ψ 52⁵, Jb 11¹⁵, 19²⁶, 21⁹, also such examples as Nu 15²⁴ *far from the eyes*, i. e. unobserved by the congregation; Pr 20³.
- ח Here also belongs the use of מִן after the ideas of *restraining, withholding from, refusing to* any one, frequently in pregnant expressions, which we can render only by complete final or consecutive clauses, e. g. 1 S 15²³ *he hath rejected thee* מִפְּלֹךְ away from (being) king, instead of מִמְּלִיכוּת מ' (as in verse 26), *that thou be no longer king*; cf. 1 K 15¹³, Is 17¹ מִעִיר so that it is no longer a city; Jer 17¹⁶, Jb 28¹¹ *he bindeth the streams* מִמִּבְּכֵי that they trickle not; Gn 16², 23⁶ מִמִּקְבֵּר that thou shouldst not bury thy dead; Is 24¹⁰.
- י The מִן has a still more pregnant force in those examples in which the idea of *precluding from anything* is only indirectly contained in the preceding verb, e. g. Gn 27¹ *his eyes were dim* מִרְאֵת away from seeing, i. e. so that he could not see; Is 7⁸ *Ephraim shall be broken in pieces* מִעַם that it be not a people (just as in Is 23¹, Jer 48^{2,42}, ψ 83⁵); Lv 26¹³, Is 5⁶, 49¹⁵, 54⁹, Ezr 2⁶² (for other pregnant constructions with מִן see below, f)³; on מִבְּלִי and מֵאֵין without, cf. § 152 y.

¹ Cf. O. Molin, *Om prepositionen min i Bibelhebreiskan*, Upsala, 1893, and especially N. Zerweck, *Die hebr. Praep. min*, Leipzig, 1893, who, instead of the partitive meaning (formerly accepted by us also), more correctly takes 'separation' as the starting-point of its various uses.

² All the *partitive* uses of מִן also come most naturally under this idea of *separation out of* a larger class. Thus מִן is used in the sense of *some, something*, and even *one*, in such expressions as *and he slew* . . . also מִשְׁרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (*divers*) of the princes of Israel, 2 Ch 21⁴; מִבֶּל־ Lv 4²; 1 K 18⁵; מִדָּם הַפָּר some of the blood of the bullock, Ex 29¹², &c.; Jb 27⁶ *my heart doth not reproach me* מִמִּי for any, i. e. for one, of my days; 38¹² מִיָּמֶיךָ one of thy days, i. e. ever in thy life (this explanation is confirmed by 1 K 1⁶; cf. also 1 S 14⁴⁵, 25²⁸). In this way also, the frequently misunderstood Hebrew (and Arabic) idiom is to be explained, by which מִן before אֶחָד, אֶחָת is equivalent to *ullus*; e. g. Lv 4² *and shall do* מֵאֶחָת מֵאֶחָת any one of these things; 5¹³, Dt 15⁷, Ez 18¹⁰; so before a *nomen unitatis* (see § 122 t), 1 S 14⁴⁵ (2 S 14¹¹, 1 K 15²) מִשְׁעַרֹת רֹאשׁוֹ not one hair of his head.—מִן is used in the sense of the Arabic *min el-beyān* or explicative *min* (often to be simply translated by *namely*), e. g. in Gn 7²² of all that was, i. e. so far as it was, probably also Gn 6² (= *whomsoever they chose*).

³ On the use of מִן to express the comparative, which likewise depends on the idea of *distance from* . . . , cf. below, § 133 a; on מִן as expressing the

(2) On the sense of *motion away from* anything depends the use of מִן after \approx such ideas as to *take away from*, to *beware*, to *be afraid of*, to *flee*, to *escape*, to *hide oneself from* (cf. καλύπτω ἀπό, *custodire ab*), sometimes again in pregnant expressions, e.g. Is 33¹⁵. On the idea of *starting from* anything depends finally the very frequent *causative* use of מִן *on account of*, *in consequence of* (cf. our *that comes from* . . .), *prae*, e.g. מִרְבַּּ for *multitude*, 1 K 8⁶.

(e) על-¹ The two original local meanings of this preposition are *upon aa* (ἐπί)² and *over* (ὑπέρ, *super*).

(1) From the original meaning *upon* is explained the use of על- after ideas of *commanding*, *commissioning* (פָּקַד על-), &c., inasmuch as the command, obligation, &c., is *laid upon* the object. The construction is self-evident in the case of to *lie*, *rest*, *lean*, *rely*, *press upon* something; cf. also, for the last, such examples as Is 1¹⁴, Jb 7²⁰, 23², and especially 2 S 18¹¹ וְעָלִי prop. *upon me* would it have been, it would have been incumbent *upon me*, &c.

(2) From the original meaning *over* is explained the use of על- after ideas *bb* of *covering*, *protecting*, *guarding* כָּסָה על-, נָגַן על-; also the combinations רַחַם על- to *have compassion upon* . . ., חוּם על-, חָמַל על- to *spare* some one, arise from the idea of a *compassionate* or *protective bending over* something. Cf. also נִלְחַם על- Ju 9¹⁷ = to *fight for* some one, i. e. in his defence.

(3) Moreover על- is used after verbs of *standing* and *going*, to express *cc* a *towering over* some one or something, sometimes in phrases, in which the original local idea has altogether fallen into the background, and which are therefore to be rendered in English by means of other prepositions (*by*, *with*, *before*, *near*), e.g. Gn 41¹, &c., Pharaoh . . . stood על-הַיָּאָר *by the Nile* (above the water level; cf. ψ 1³), and so especially עָמַד על- in the pregnant sense to *stand serving before* some one (prop. *over* one who sits or reclines at table) Zc 4¹⁴ (cf. Is 6², where מִמַּעַל לְ is used for על-); הִתְיַצַּב על- to *present oneself by command* before some one, Jb 1⁶, &c. Cf. also עָלֶיךָ, עַל-יָדְךָ (Jb 14¹) *near*, *at* (on) the side of some one or something.

(4) From the original meaning *above* (not, as formerly explained, *on to dd* something, *at* something) there arise finally all the various constructions with על- in the sense of *towards*, *against*. The original idea (which in many of these constructions has become wholly unrecognizable) starts from the view that the assailant endeavours to take up his position *over* the person attacked, so as to reach him from above, or to *overpower* him; cf. especially על-קִים to *rise up over*, i. e. *against* some one, then with a transference of

distance of time from a fixed limit, in the sense of *after*, e.g. ψ 73²⁰ מִתְקִיץ *after awaking* (cf. ἐξ ἀπίστου, *ab itinere*), or *after the lapse of* . . ., e.g. Gn 38²⁴, Ho 6², and very frequently מִקֵּץ *from the end of*, i. e. *after the lapse of* . . ., see the Lexicon; also for the use of מִן to represent *resting beside* anything, like the Latin *prope abesse ab* . . .

¹ Cf. Budie, *Die hebr. Präpos. 'Al* (על), Halle, 1882.

² Since the placing *upon* anything is an addition to it, על- also implies *in addition to* something, cf. Gn 28⁹ (31⁵⁰); 30⁴⁰, 32¹² (probably a proverbial saying = *mother and children*); Dt 22⁶. Also על- notwithstanding is no doubt properly *in addition to*, e.g. Jb 10⁷ although thou knowest, prop. *in addition to thy knowing*.—From the original meaning *upon* is also derived that of *on account of* (prop. *upon the ground of*) and *in agreement with*, *according to*, since the pattern is regarded as the foundation *upon* which a thing stands or rests.

thought applied to any kind of hostile approach, **עַל־** *to fight against* . . . , **עַל־** *to encamp against* . . . , **עַל־** *to be gathered together, to assemble against* (Mi 4¹¹; cf. ψ 2²), &c. ; even after verbs which express a mental action, e.g. **עַל־** *to imagine evil against any one, &c.*

ee 4. Sometimes a preposition appears to be under the immediate government of a verb, which, by its meaning, excludes such a union. In reality the preposition is dependent on a verb (generally a verb of motion), which, for the sake of brevity, is not expressed, but in sense is contained in what is apparently the governing verb.

ff Various examples of this *constructio praegnans* have been already noticed above in *x* and *y* under **מִן־**; for **מִן־** cf. also ψ 22²² **וּמִקֶּרְנֵי רְמוֹם עֲנִיִּיתִנִּי** and thou hast answered and saved me from the horns of the wild oxen (in Is 38¹⁷, which Delitzsch translates by *thou hast loved and delivered my soul from the pit*, read **חֲשַׁבְתָּ** with the LXX); Gn 25²³, ■ S 18¹⁹, Jb 28¹²; cf. also ψ 73²⁷ **וְזָנָה מִן־** to go a whoring from any one i.e. to be unfaithful to him; ψ 18²² **רָשַׁע מִן־** = to depart wickedly from God; ψ 28¹ **חָרַשׁ מִן־** to be silent from one (to turn away in silence); cf. Jb 13¹³ [; so with **יַעַל** Jb 30^{17,30}].

gg Pregnant constructions with **אַחֲרַי**: Nu 14²⁴ equivalent to **וַיֵּמְלֵא לָלֶכֶת אַחֲרַי** and he made full to walk i.e. walked fully after me; in 1 S 13⁷ read with the LXX **וַיִּתְרַדּוּ מֵאַחֲרָיו** they trembled, i.e. went trembling away from him; with **אַל־** Gn 43³³ **אַל־** **תָּמָה** to turn in astonishment to some one (cf. Is 13⁸); **אַל־** Is 11¹⁰, &c., to turn inquiringly to some one; **אַל־** Is 41¹ **הִתְרַשֵּׁי אֶל־** to turn in silence to some one; **אַל־** Gn 42²⁸ **תָּרַדּוּ** to turn trembling to some one (cf. **תָּרַדּוּ לִקְרֹאת** to come trembling to meet, 1 S 21² [also with **שָׂמַח**, **הִרְיִן**, **שָׂאָה** and other verbs, Ju 14⁵, 15¹⁴, 19³; see Lexicon]); cf. further Jer 41⁷, ψ 7⁷, 2 Ch 32¹; with **בִּ** ψ 55¹⁹ he hath redeemed and hath put my soul in peace, exactly like ψ 118⁵; with **בִּ** ψ 74⁷ they have profaned and cast . . . even to the ground; cf. 89⁴⁰.

hh 5. In poetic parallelism the governing power of a preposition is sometimes extended to the corresponding substantive of the second member; ¹ e.g. **בִּ** Is 40¹⁹, 48¹⁴ he shall perform his pleasure **בְּבָבֶל** on Babylon, and his arm shall be **בְּשָׂדִים** (for **בְּבָשָׂדִים**) on the Chaldeans; Jb 15³; **לִ** Is 28⁶, 42²² (but probably **לִ** has fallen out after another **לִ**), Ez 39⁴, Jb 34¹⁰ (perhaps also Gn 45⁸; **מִשָּׁל** may, however, be taken here as a second accusative according to § 117 ii); **מִן־** Is 48⁹; **לִמְעַן** Is 58¹³, ψ 141⁹ (unless **וּמִמְקֹשֹׁת** is to be read); **עַד־** Is 15⁸; **תַּחַת** Is 61⁷.

ii 6. Adverbs which have acquired a substantival value are sometimes governed by prepositions, e.g. **אַל־חִנָּם** in vain, Ez 6¹⁰; **אַחֲרֵיכֶן** after this; **בִּכֵּן** (Ec 8¹⁰, Est 4¹⁶) then, on this condition; **לָכֵן** and **עַל־כֵּן** therefore; **עַד־כֵּן** hitherto.

¹ Similarly the force of a negative is sometimes extended to the parallel member; see § 152 z.

§ 120. *Verbal Ideas under the Government of a Verb.*
Co-ordination of Complementary Verbal Ideas.

1. When a *relative* verb (incomplete in itself) receives its necessary *a* complement in the form of a verbal idea, the latter is, as a rule, subordinated in the infinitive construct (with or without לְ), less frequently in the infinitive absolute, in a few instances in the form of a participle (or verbal adjective), or finally in the imperfect without the copula. In these combinations the principal idea is very frequently represented by the subordinate member of the sentence, whilst the governing verb rather contains a mere definition of the manner of the action; cf. *d* and *g* below, and § 114 *n*, note 2.

(a) On the subordination of an infinitive construct as an accusative of the *b* object, and as the complement of relative verbal ideas, see above, § 114 *c*, and the numerous examples given in § 114 *m*; on the infinitive absolute as object, see § 113 *d*.—The complement in the form of a participle (as in Greek, and also frequently in Syriac) occurs in Is 33¹ בְּהִתְמַךְ שׁוֹרֵר (cf. for the form, § 67 *v*) *when thou hast ceased as a spoiler*, i. e. to spoil; Jer 22³⁰ לֹא יִצְלַח . . . יֹשֵׁב *he shall never prosper, sitting*, i. e. so as to sit, &c.; Jon 1⁶ *what meanest thou, sleeping?* i. e. that thou sleepest; ¹ by a verbal adjective, 1 S 3² *now his eyes* הִחֲלָו בְּהוֹת *had begun being dim*, i. e. to wax dim (unless we read בְּהוֹת = לְבָהוֹת, cf. § 114 *m*); by a substantive, Gn 9²⁰ *and Noah began to be an husbandman* (omitting the article before אֲדָמָה).

(b) Examples of the subordination of the complementary verbal idea in the *c* imperfect² (in English usually rendered by *to*, *in order to* or *that*) are—(1) with both verbs in the same person: after the perfect, Is 42²¹ יִהְיֶה חֶפֶץ . . . יִגְדִּיל *it pleased the Lord . . . to magnify, &c.*; Jb 30²⁸, 32²² לֹא יֵדְעֵתִי אֲכַנָּה *I know not to give flattering titles*; after a perfect consecutive, 1 S 20¹⁹ (where for הָרָר we should read with the LXX תִּפְקֹר); after an imperfect, ψ 88¹¹, 102¹⁴, Jb 19³, 24¹⁴; after an imperf. consec., Jb 16⁸; after a participle, Is 5^{11a}.—(2) with a difference in the persons: after a perfect, Lv 9⁶ *this is the thing* אֲשֶׁר-צִוָּה *which the Lord commanded (that) ye should do*; a negative imperfect follows צִוָּה in La 1¹⁰; after the imperfect, Is 47¹ (5) כִּי לֹא תוֹסִיפִי עוֹד *for thou shalt no more continue (that) they call thee*, i. e. thou shalt no longer be called, &c.; Ho 1⁶ לֹא אוֹסִיף עוֹד אֲרַחֵם *I will no longer continue (and) have mercy*, i. e. *I will no more have mercy*; Is 52¹, Pr 23³⁵.—Nu 22⁶ *peradventure I shall prevail (that) we may smite them, and (that) I may drive them out of the land* אוֹלִי, however, be a scribal error for נוֹכַל, due to the preceding אוֹלִי, and in that case the example would belong to No. 1); after a participle,

¹ In 1 S 16¹⁶, which appears to be a case of this kind, two different readings are combined, יֵדַע לִנְנִי and the simple מִנְנִי.

² This kind of subordination is frequent in Arabic and in Syriac (cf. e. g. the Peshittā, Luke 18¹³); as a rule, however, a conjunction (corresponding to our *that*) is inserted. Cf. moreover, the Latin *quid vis faciam?* Terence; *volo hoc oratori contingat*, Cicero, Brut. 84; and our *I would it were*; *I thought he would go*.

2 S 21⁴.—A perfect is possibly subordinated in La 1¹⁰; but the explanation of אֲשֶׁר as a relative clause is preferable.

d 2. Instead of subordination (as in the cases mentioned in a-c), the co-ordination of the complementary verbal idea in the finite verb (cf. above, c) frequently occurs, either—

(a) With the second verb co-ordinated in a form exactly corresponding to the first (but see below, e) by means of וְ (1, 2).¹ As a rule, here also (see above, a) the principal idea is introduced only by the second verb, while the first (especially שָׁב, יָסַף,² הוֹסִיף) contains the definition of the manner of the action, e.g. Gn 26¹⁸ וַיֵּשֶׁב וַיַּחְדָּר—and he returned and digged, i.e. he digged again; 2 K 1^{11,13}; in the perfect consecutive, Is 6¹³; with הוֹסִיף, e.g. Gn 25¹ and Abraham added and took a wife, i.e. again took a wife; Gn 38⁵ and frequently; with הוֹאִיל in the jussive, Jb 6⁹; in the imperative (cf. § 110 h), Ju 19⁶ הוֹאִל־נָא וְיָשָׁב וְיָרָח וְיָרָח וְיָרָח be content, I pray thee, and tarry all night (cf. the English he was persuaded and remained, for to remain); 2 S 7²⁹; with מָהֵר Gn 24^{18,20}, &c.; with הִמָּדֵר Ct 2³.

e Rem. 1. Instead of an exact agreement between co-ordinate verbal forms, other combinations sometimes occur, viz. imperfect and perfect consecutive (cf. § 112 d), e.g. Dt 31¹² that they וְיָרְאוּ אֶת־יְהוָה יִלְמְדוּ may learn, and fear the Lord, i.e. to fear the Lord; Is 1¹⁹, Ho 2¹¹, Est 8⁶, Dn 9^{25b}; perfect and imperfect, Jb 23³ (O that I knew how I might find him); perfect and imperfect consecutive, Jos 7⁷, Ec 4^{1,7}; jussive and imperative, Jb 17¹⁰; cf., finally, Gn 47⁶ וְאִם־יִדְעָה וְיִשְׁכַּח and if thou knowest and there are among them, &c., i.e. that there are among them.

f 2. Special mention must be made of the instances in which the natural complement of the first verb is suppressed, or is added immediately after in the form of an historical statement, e.g. Gn 42²⁵ then Joseph commanded and they filled³ (prop. that they should fill, and they filled ...; cf. the full form of expression in Gn 50²); a further command is then added by means of וְ and the infinitive; Ex 36⁶; another instance of the same kind is Gn 30²⁷ I have divined and the Lord hath blessed me, &c., i.e. that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake.

g (b) With the second verb (which, according to the above, represents the principal idea) attached without the copula⁴ in the same mood, &c. In this construction (cf. § 110 h) the imperatives קִימִי, קִימָה (קִימָה), קִימֵם,

¹ Cf. the English colloquial expression *I will try and do it*.

² Of a different kind are the cases in which יָסַף with a negative is co-ordinated with a verb to emphasize the non-recurrence of the action; cf. Nu 11²⁵ they prophesied and added not, sc. to prophesy, i.e. but they did so no more; Dt 5¹⁹, Jb 27¹⁹ (reading יִסְפֶּה וְלֹא יִסְפֶּה).

³ Cf. the analogous examples in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 102.

⁴ To be distinguished, of course, from the cases in which two equally important and independent verbs are used together without the copula in vigorous poetic imagery, e.g. Ex 15⁹, Jb 29⁸, &c.

&c.) and לָהּ (לָכָה, לָכִי, &c.) are exceedingly common with the sense of interjections, before verbs which express a movement or other action, e. g. קוּם הִתְחַלֵּף *arise, walk*, Gn 13¹⁷, 19¹⁵, 27⁴³; in the plural, Gn 19¹⁴; Ex 19²⁴ לֵךְ-יֵרֶד *go, get thee down*; 1 S 3⁹; with a following cohortative, 1 S 9¹⁰ לָכָה גִּלְכָּה *come, let us go*; Gn 31⁴⁴ and frequently.—Also with שׁוּב (a periphrasis for *again*) in the perfect, Zc 8¹⁵; in the imperfect, Mi 7¹⁹, ψ 7¹³, 59⁷, 71²⁰; in the jussive, Jb 10¹⁶; in the cohortative, Gn 30³¹; in the imperative, Jos 5², 1 S 3⁵ *lie down again*; הוֹאִיל (sometimes to express the idea of *willingly* or *gladly*) in the perfect, Dt 1⁵, Ho 5¹¹; in the imperative, Jb 6²⁸; הִרְבָּה = *much*, 1 S 2³ אֶל-תִּרְבּוּ תִרְבּוּ *do not multiply and talk, i. e. talk not so much arrogancy*; in the imperative, ψ 51⁴, הִחַל, Dt 2²⁴ רֵשׁ הִחַל *begin, possess*; יָבֵל, La 4¹⁴ בְּלֹא יָבֵלוּ *without men's being able to touch, &c.*; מְהֵרָה = *quickly*, in the perfect, ψ 106¹³; in the imperative, Gn 19²², Ju 9⁴⁸, Est 6¹⁰.—Other examples are: Ho 9⁹ הֵעֵמִיק = *deeply, radically*; Zp 3⁷ הַשְׁקִים = *early* (even in the participle, Ho 6⁴, 13³); Is 29⁴ נִשְׁפַּל = *low*, cf. Jer 13¹⁸; Jos 3¹⁶ כָּמֹם = *wholly*; ψ 112⁹ פָּצַר = *plentifully*.

Rem. This co-ordination without the copula belongs (as being more *h* vigorous and bolder) rather to poetic or otherwise elevated style (cf. e. g. Is 52¹, Ho 1⁶, 9⁹ with Gn 25¹, &c.). Asyndeton, however, is not wanting even in prose; besides the above examples (especially the imperatives of קוּם and הִלֵּךְ Gn 30³¹, Dt 1⁵, 2²⁴, Jos 3¹⁶, 1 S 3⁵) cf. also Neh 3²⁰, 1 Ch 13². For special reasons the verb representing the principal idea may even come first; thus Is 53¹¹ יִרְאֶה וְיִשְׂבַּע *he shall see, he shall be satisfied* (sc. with the sight), for the satisfaction does not come until after the enjoyment of the sight; Jer 4⁵ מְלֵא צֶהֳרָא *cry, fill, i. e. cry with a full (loud) voice*.

§ 121. Construction of Passive Verbs.

Blake, 'The internal passive in Semitic,' JAOS. xxii.

1. Verbs which in the active take *one* accusative (either of the *a* proper object, or of the *internal* object, or of some other nearer definition; cf. § 117 *a*, *p*, *u*) may in the passive, according to our mode of expression, be construed *personally*, the object of the active sentence now becoming the subject, e. g. Gn 35¹⁹ וַתָּמָת רָחֵל וַתִּקָּבֶר *and Rachel died, and was buried, &c.* The passive, however, is also used *impersonally* (in the 3rd sing. masc.), either absolutely, as Dt 21³⁴, Is 16¹⁰, Ez 16³⁴ (with a dative added, 2 S 17¹⁶, Is 53⁵, La 5⁵), or, more frequently, with the object of the active construction still subordinated in the accusative,¹ e. g. Gn 27⁴² וַיִּגְדַּל לְרֵכָה אֶת-דְּבָרֵי עֵשָׂו *and there were told (i. e. one told) to Rebekah the words of Esau*; 2 S 21¹¹, 1 K 18¹³.

¹ When this is not recognizable either by the *nota accusativi*, or by its disagreement with the passive form in gender, number, and person, it

b Other examples are: after Niph., Gn 4¹⁸ וַיֵּלֶד לְחֵנוֹךְ אֶת־עֵירָד and unto Enoch was born Irad (cf. Nu 26⁶⁰, and after an infinitive, Gn 21⁵); Gn 17⁵, 21⁸ (after an infinitive); 29²⁷ (unless וְנִתְּנָה is 1st plur. cohortative); Ex 21²³, 25²³, Lv 6¹³, Nu 7¹⁰ (after an infinitive); 26⁵⁵ (cf. verse 53); Dt 20⁸ (where, however, for יָמוֹס the Hiph. יָמוֹס should be read, according to 1²⁸); Jos 7¹⁵, Is 16¹⁰; with the object preceding, Ex 13⁷, Lv 2⁸, 19²⁰, Nu 16²⁹, Dan 9^{24.1}.—Also after Pu'al, Jer 50²⁰; before Pu'al, Is 14⁸ אֲשֶׁר equivalent to the internal object עֲבָרָה = which they have caused to be served by thee; Jb 22⁹; according to the Masoretic text also Gn 46²², where, however, the Samaritan and LXX read יִלְדָּה for יֵלֶד; the Samaritan in Gn 35²⁶ and 46²⁷ also reads יִלְדָּה, and this (or יֵלֶד) should certainly be read instead of יֵלֶד in 2 S 21²².—After Hoph., Ex 10⁸, 27⁷, Lv 10¹⁸, 16²⁷, Nu 32⁵, 1 K 2²¹, Pr 16³³, Jb 30¹⁵; after the infinitive Hoph., Gn 40²⁰, Ez 16^{4f.}, 27⁷; before Hoph., Is 17¹, 21², Ho 10⁶, Zc 13⁶; after the infinitive Hothpa'el, Lv 13^{55f.}

c 2. Verbs which in the active take two accusatives (§ 117 cc) retain in the passive construction at least one accusative, namely that of the second or remoter object, whilst the nearer object now becomes the subject. Thus, corresponding to אֲשֶׁר אֶרְאֶה which I will show thee (Gn 12¹) the passive is אֲשֶׁר אֶתָּה מְרָאָה (Ex 25⁴⁰) which thou hast been shown, i.e. which has been shown to thee; cf. Ex 26³⁰ (but in Lv 13⁴⁹ with an accusative of the person); Jb 7³. In ψ 22¹⁶ מִדְּבַק מִלִּקְוֹתַי depends on an assumed transitive הִרְבִּיק governing two accusatives (= my tongue is made to cleave to my jaws); also in Is 1²⁰, הָרֵב תִּאָּכְלוּ ye shall be devoured with the sword, הָרֵב is not an accus. instrumenti, but most probably an accusative of the object retained from the active construction.²

d Rem. 1. - Examples of the retention of the second accusative are—(α) with verba induendi and exuendi (§ 117 cc), ψ 80¹¹, כָּפוּ הָרִים צֶלֶה the mountains were covered with the shadow of it (the vine); Pr 19²³. So also some of the examples in § 116 k of passive participles of these verbs, Ju 18¹¹, 1 S 2¹⁸, 17⁵, 1 K 22¹⁰,

naturally cannot be determined whether the construction is really impersonal. The construction itself can only be explained by supposing that while using the passive form the speaker at the same time thinks of some author or authors of the action in question, just as on the theory of the Arab grammarians a concealed agent is included in every passive. This accounts for the possibility (cf. § 144 g) of using the active without a specified subject as a periphrasis for the passive.

¹ In 2 K 18³⁰ יִתֵּן is to be read or אֶת־ is to be omitted, as in the parallel passage Is 36¹⁵.

² In the active, the sentence would be I will cause the sword to devour you; by the rule stated above, under c, this would become in the passive, the sword (nom.) shall be made to devour you (acc.). Instead of this, the remoter object is here made the subject, and the nearer object is retained in the accusative. Otherwise, the only possible explanation would be, according to the Arabic idiom, to cause one to devour the sword (remoter object), i.e. to give him over to it. It would then be simplest to read תִּאָּכְלוּ.

Ez 9^{2,3}; ¹ with the accusative preceding, Neh 4¹².—(b) with *verba copiae* and *inopiae*, Ex 17, Is 38¹⁰ (equivalent to *I must forego the residue of my years*); Is 40²⁰.—(c) an accusative of the result (§ 117 ii) with the passive, Is 61¹, Zc 14⁴, Jb 28²; with the accusative preceding, Is 24¹², Mi 3¹² (Jer 26¹⁸), Jb 15⁷, 22¹⁶.² Also in Ez 40¹⁷ and 46²³, the accusative preceding עָשִׂי (in 41¹⁸ following it) can only be taken as the accusative of the result; some general idea, such as that of *place*, is to be understood as the subject of עָשִׂי.—(d) an accusative of the member or part specially affected by the action (§ 117 ii), Gn 17¹¹, 14²⁴, Ju 17 (accusative *before* part. pass.); 2 S 15³² (accusative with suffix after the part. pass.).

2. Both accusatives are retained in an unusual manner after the passive of *e* a *verbum implendi* in Nu 14²¹; instead, however, of the *Niph.* וַיִּפְּלֵה the *Qal* (which is sometimes used transitively elsewhere) should simply be read with the LXX; similarly in ψ 72¹⁹, although there the LXX also translate the passive.

3. The efficient cause (or personal agent) is, as a rule, attached to *f* the passive by לְ (thus corresponding to the Greek and Latin dative), e. g. Gn 25²¹ וַיַּעֲתֵר לוֹ יְהוָה the Lord let himself be intreated by him; cf. Lv 26²³, ψ 73¹⁰ and the blessing בְּרוּךְ הוּא לַיהוָה blessed be he of the Lord Ru 2²⁰; cf. Gn 14¹⁹, Ju 17^{2b}, 1 S 15¹³; also in the plural, 1 S 23²¹ (2 S 2⁵, ψ 115¹⁵).—Before the verb, Pr 14²⁰ and frequently; less commonly by מִן (called מִן of origin = *coming from*), e. g. Gn 9¹¹; before the verb, ψ 37²³, Jb 24¹; by בְּ (*instrumenti*) [rarely, König § 106], Gn 9⁶ (בְּאָדָם by man); Nu 36², Is 14^{3b} [but ? = *wherewith it was worked* (§ 52 e) with thee; cf. Dt 21³, König § 106; and see בְּ עָבַר in the Lexicon], Ho 14⁴, always to introduce a personal agent.—On the connexion of the passive participle with הַ genitive of the agent, cf. § 116 l.

II. Syntax of the Noun.

§ 122. Indication of the Gender of the Noun.

Cf. F. Schwabe, *Die Genusbestimmung des Nomens im bibl. Hebr.*, Jena, 1894, and especially the thorough investigation by K. Albrecht, 'Das Geschlecht der hebr. Hauptwörter,' in *ZAW.* 1895, p. 313 ff., and 1896, p. 61 ff. H. Rosenberg, 'Zum Geschlecht der hebr. Hauptwörter,' in *ZAW.* 1905, p. 325 ff. (supplementing Albrecht's work by a treatment of the gender of many nouns in the Mishna); and his 'Notizen aus der tannaitischen Literatur...' *ZAW.* 1908, p. 144 ff.

1. According to § 80 a, Hebrew, like the other Semitic languages, *a* distinguishes only a *masculine* and *feminine* gender. To indicate the

¹ Analogous to הַלְבִּישׁ הַבְּרִים who was clothed in linen, Ez 9⁸, would be וַהֲנוֹתָר הָהָה אֶת־הַהֲמוֹן הָהָה 2 Ch 31¹⁰; but we must certainly read there וַנִּתָּר with the LXX.—Still less can ψ 87³ be so explained, נִכְבְּדוֹת being not an accusative, but the subject of a noun-clause. On the other hand, וְשָׁלִיחַ 1 K 14⁶ may be explained with Ewald in the sense of *being charged with* something, so that, לְצִיָּה, it may be construed with an accusative.

² In reality וַיִּרָם Ex 16^{20,28} (it became putrid) is equivalent to a passive (it was changed), to which הוֹלָעִים is added as an accusative of the result.

latter a special feminine ending is generally used (§ 80 *b* and § 87 *i*) both in the singular and plural (see, however, § 87 *p*), its use being most consistent in adjectives and participles; cf. § 87 *r*. The employment of these special endings is most natural when by means of them the feminine names of persons or animals are distinguished from the masculine of the same stem and the same formation, e. g. *אָח* *brother*, *אָחוּת* *sister*; *עָלָם* *a young man*, *עָלְמָה* *a young woman, maid*; *פֶּרֶי* *iuvenecus*, *פְּרִיָּה* *iuvenca*; *עֵגֶל* *vitulus*, *עֵגְלָה* *vitula*. On the other hand, the feminine plays an important part in denoting the gender of whole classes of ideas (see below, *p*, &c.), which the Hebrew regards as feminine. The language, however, is not obliged to use the feminine ending either for the purpose of distinguishing the *sex* of animate objects (see *b*), or as an indication of the (*figurative*) gender of inanimate things which are regarded as feminine (see *h*).

b 2. The distinction of *sex* may be effected even without the feminine ending, (*a*) by the employment of words of different stems for the masculine and feminine; (*b*) by the different construction (either as masculine or feminine) of the same word (*communia*). But the distinction may also, (*c*) in the case of names of animals, be entirely neglected, all examples of a species being included under one particular gender, either masculine or feminine (*epicoena*).

c Examples of (*a*) are: *אָב* *father*, *אִמָּה* *mother*; *אֵיל* *ram*, *רֵחַל* *ewe*; *תֵּישׁ* *he-goat*, *עֵז* *she-goat*; *חֲמֹור* *he-ass*, *אֲתוֹן* *she-ass*; *אֲרִיָּה* *lion*, *לִבְיָא* *lioness*. Sometimes with the feminine ending as well, e. g. *עֶבֶד* *male slave, man-servant*, *אֲמָה* or *שִׁפְחָה* *female slave, maid*; *חָתָן* *bridegroom*, *כַּלָּה* *bride*.

d Of (*b*): *גָּמֶל* *camel*. Plur. *גָּמְלִים* construed as masculine, Gn 24⁶³; as feminine, Gn 32¹⁶; *בָּקָר* collect. *oxen*, Ex 21³⁷, construed as masculine, but in Gn 33¹³, Jb 1¹⁴ as feminine. In Jer 2²⁴ the construction of *פֶּרִיָּה* *wild ass*, changes directly from the masculine (intended as epicene) to the feminine. Cf. the Greek *ὁ, ἡ παῖς* *ὁ, ἡ βοῦς*.

c Of (*c*): analogous to the epicene nouns of other languages, many species of animals which are strong and courageous, are regarded in Hebrew as always masculine, while the weak and timid are feminine; cf. *ὁ λύκος, ἡ χελιδὼν*, and the German *der Löwe, der Adler*, &c., but *die Katze, die Taube*, &c. Similarly in Hebrew, e. g. *אֵלֶּוֹף* *ox* (ψ 144¹⁴ even referring to cows when pregnant), *דָּב* *bear*, Ho 13⁸ *דָּב שֶׁכֹּוֹל* (*a bear that is bereaved of her whelps*; cf., however, 2 K 2²⁴, Is 11⁷), *זָאֵב* *wolf*, *כָּלָב* *dog*, all masculine; but *אֲרָנָבֶת* *hare*, *יוֹנָה* *dove*, *חֲסִידָה* *stork*, *דְּבוּרָה* *bee*, *נְמָלָה* *ant*, &c., feminine.

f Rem. 1. Masculine nouns which either have a separate feminine form or might easily form one, are but seldom used as epicene; such are, *חֲמֹור* *ass*, 2 S 19²⁷ for *אֲתוֹן*; *אֵיל* *hart*, ψ 42² for *אֵילָה*. In Gn 23^{3π}. *מֵת* *a dead body*, refers more especially to the body of a woman; *אֲמֹן* *a master workman*, in Pr 8³⁰ refers to wisdom (*חֲכָמָה* feminine, cf. Plin. 2, 1 *natura omnium artifex*; and our

use of *friend, teacher, servant, neighbour*, either as masculine or feminine; in German, *Gemahl*¹ spouse, also for fem. *Gemahlin*, &c.).

2. Of words denoting persons נָעָר *na'ar*, according to the formerly common *g* opinion, was in early times used as epicene (see, however, above, § 2 n). The use of the plural נָעָרִים in Jb 1¹⁹ and Ru 2²¹ in the sense of *young people* (of both genders) does not, however, prove this. In this and in similar cases (cf. e.g. אָהָם Gn 1²⁷ and אָהָתָם 32¹) the masculine as *prior gender* includes the feminine.²

3. The following classes of ideas are usually regarded as feminine,³ *h* although the substantives which express them are mostly without the feminine ending:⁴

(a) Names of *countries* and *towns*, since they are regarded as the mothers⁵ and nurses of the inhabitants; e.g. אַשּׁוּר *Assyria*, אֲדָם *Idumaea*, צֹר *Tyre*; cf. also such expressions as בַּת צִיּוֹן, בֵּית בָּבֶל *daughter of Babylon, daughter of Zion*, &c. On the other hand appellatives which are originally masculine, remain so when used as place-names, e.g. אֶם 5⁵ בֵּית-רָאֵל, הַגִּלְגָּל, &c.

Rem. The same proper nouns, which as names of countries are regarded *i* as feminine, are frequently used also as names of the people, and may then, like national names in other languages, be construed as masculine (the national name almost always being used also as the personal name of the supposed ancestor of the people); thus יְהוּדָה masc. Is 3⁸, &c., *Judaei*; but

¹ So in early Arabic, *ba'l* (lord) and *zauḡ* (conjux) are used both for *maritus* and *uxor*; *'arūs* for *bridegroom* and *bride*; the later language, however, distinguishes the feminine from the masculine in all these cases generally by the ending *a* (*at*). In early Arabic also the feminine ending is commonly omitted in such participles as *ḥāmil*, *bāṭin* (*gravidā*), and the like, which from the nature of the case can only be used of females. Thus also אִמָּן, at least in Nu 11¹² (Is 49²³?), probably means *nurse* (for אִמָּתָה 2 S 4⁴, &c.), not *nursing-father*.

² The Arab grammarians call this use of the masculine plural and dual (e.g. *el-abawāni*, the two fathers, i.e. *parentes*) *taghlīb* or *the making* (the masculine) *prevail* (over the feminine).—Cf. M. Grünert, *Die Begriffs-Präponderanz und die Duale a potiori im Altarab.*, Vienna, 1886.

³ The masculine gender is attributed 'by the Hebrews and the Semites generally to whatever is dangerous, savage, courageous, respected, great, strong, powerful...; the feminine to whatever is motherly, productive, sustaining, nourishing, gentle, weak, ... subject, &c.' (Albrecht, *ZAW.* 1896, p. 120 f.).

⁴ When, on the other hand, words *with* a feminine-ending, such as קֶשֶׁת *a bow* (stem קוּשׁ), עֵת *time* (see the Lexicon), are sometimes construed as masculine, this is owing probably in some cases to a misunderstanding of the formation of the word, the ה of the feminine being regarded as a radical.

⁵ Cf. *a city and a mother* (אִמָּה) in Israel, 2 S 20¹⁹. In the same way אִמָּה (like μήτηρ, *mater*) on Phoenician coins stands for *mother-city*, μητρόπολις. The same figure is used in such expressions as *sons of Zion*, ψ 149²; *sons of Babylon*, Ez 23¹⁵, &c., as also in speaking of the suburbs of a city as its *daughters*, e.g. Jos 15⁴⁵ ff., &c.—The comparison of Jerusalem to a woman is especially frequent in allegorical descriptions, e.g. Ez 16²³, La 1¹, &c.

Is 7⁶, fem., *Judaea*; אֲדָמָה masc., *Idumaei*, Nu 20²⁰; fem., *Idumaea*, Jer 49¹⁷. Nevertheless, it sometimes happens that by a very common transference of thought (just as we say *Turkey concludes peace*) these names are construed as feminine, even when they denote not the country but the inhabitants; so יְהוּדָה La 1³; cf. Gn 41⁸, Ex 10⁷, 12³³, 1 S 17²¹, 2 S 8², 24⁹, Is 7², 21², 42¹¹, Jer 50¹⁰, Jb 1¹⁶. Hence the frequent personification of nations (as well as of countries and towns, see *h*, note 5) as female beings, e.g. Is 50¹, 54¹, and the use of the expressions בֵּית צִיּוֹן Is 47¹, &c. (see above) as collective poetical personifications of the people.

k (b) Appellative nouns, which denote a *circumscribed space*, such as אֶרֶץ *earth, land*, עוֹלָם *world*, שְׂאֵל *the abode of the dead*, כְּכֹר *circle* (of the Jordan valley), עִיר *a town*, בְּאֵר *a well*, צָפוֹן *the north*, תֵּימָן *the south*.

l In the majority of nouns denoting place the gender is variable, e.g. אֶרֶץ and דֶּרֶךְ *a way* (usually feminine; the masculine gender only begins to predominate with Ezekiel; cf. Albrecht, l. c., 1896, p. 55), נֵיָא *valley*, גֶּן *garden* (fem. Gn 2¹⁵, unless לְעֵבְרָה, &c., is to be read), הַיְכָל *palace, temple*, חֲצֵר *court*, כְּרָם *vineyard*, שַׁעַר *door*,¹ &c.; also מָקוֹם *place*, at least in Gn 18²⁴ (referring to Sodom), Jb 20⁹, and 2 S 17¹² *Kethibh*, is construed as feminine. The mountains and hills commanding the surrounding country are almost without exception masculine (see Albrecht, l. c., p. 60 f.).

m (c) The names of *instruments, utensils*, and (on the same analogy) *members and parts of the body* in man or beast, since these are all regarded as subservient and subordinate (consequently as feminine).

n Thus חֶרֶב *sword*, יֵתֶד *tent-peg*, כֶּדַּיִם *bucket*, כּוֹס *cup*, נָעַל *shoe*, טֵרֶשׁ *bed*, &c.; in other cases, as אָרוֹן *chest, ark* (with the article הָאָרוֹן), תִּנּוֹר *oven*, the gender is variable. ('Instruments for binding or holding, girdles and the like, as constraining and mastering, are masculine,' Albrecht, l. c., p. 89.)—Also אוֹן *ear* (and in general, members occurring in pairs, Albrecht, l. c., p. 73 f.), אֶצְבַּע *finger* (and so probably בֶּהֱן *thumb, great toe*), יָד and כַּף *hand*, יָמִין *right hand*, רֶגֶל *foot*, בִּרְךָ *knee*, יֵרֶךְ *thigh*, כַּתֵּף *shoulder*, לֵחִי *cheek*, בֶּטֶן *belly*, כִּנָּף *wing*, קֶרֶן *horn*, שֵׁן *tooth*; as a rule also יָדוּעַ *arm* (masc. Is 17⁵, &c.), לָשׁוֹן *tongue* (masc. ψ 22¹⁶, Pr 26²⁸, &c.), עֵיִן *eye* (masc. Zc 3⁹, &c.), שֵׁק *thigh* (masc. Ex 29²⁷).²

o (d) Certain names of natural forces or substances are feminine, being probably regarded as instruments, while in the names of the heavens, the heavenly bodies and natural phenomena, the masculine generally predominates (cf. Albrecht, l. c., p. 323 ff.); thus feminine are שֶׁמֶשׁ *sun* (but often also masc., ψ 19⁶, 104¹⁹); אֵשׁ (*Ethiopic 'ēsāt*)

¹ מַחֲנֶה *camp* is feminine only when it is a collective, denoting the persons in a camp.

² אָף *nose*, גִּיד *sinew*, זָנָב *tail*, חֶף *palate*, כֶּבֶד *liver*, לֵב *heart*, רֵחִים *bowels*, מֵעִים *bowels*, מֵעָה *forehead*, עוֹר *skin*, עֶרֶף *back of the neck*, פֶּה *mouth*, צְוּאָה *neck*, רֹאשׁ *head*, שֵׁכָם *shoulder*, also רֶחֶם *womb*, except in Jer 20¹⁷, are invariably construed as masculine.—עָצָם *bone* is common.

fire (rarely masc.); *נֹרָא* brightness, *אֶבֶן* a stone, as a rule also *רוּחַ* wind, spirit; *נְפֶשׁ* breath, soul; also *אוֹר* light in Jer 13¹⁶, Jb 36³², and others.

4. The following classes of ideas, which are also regarded as *p* feminine in Hebrew (see above, *h*), are usually indicated by the feminine form, notwithstanding their occasional transference to masculine persons (see *r* and *s*):

(a) Abstracts¹ (sometimes along with masculine forms from the same stem, as *נִקְמָה* vengeance, as well as *נָקַם*, *עֲזָרָה* help, as well as *עָזַר*), e.g. *אֱמוּנָה* firmness, faithfulness, *גְּבוּרָה* strength, *גְּדֻלָּה* greatness, *מְלֵאכָה* fullness, *מְמִשְׁלָה* dominion, &c. Similarly, the feminine (sing. and plur.) of adjectives and participles is used substantively in the sense of the Latin and Greek *neuter*, e.g. *נְכוּנָה* steadfastness, *ψ* 5¹⁰, *טוֹבָה* goodness, *רָעָה* evil, Gn 50²⁰, *נִקְלָה* a light thing (i.e. a trifling thing), Jer 6¹⁴; so especially in the plural, e.g. *גְּדֻלוֹת* great things, *ψ* 12⁴; *הַתְּרוֹסוֹת* the ruined places, Ez 36³⁶, along with *הַנִּשְׁמָה* that which was desolate, *טוֹבוֹת* kindnesses, 2 K 25²⁸, *נְכוּנוֹת* uprightness, honesty, Is 26¹⁰, *נְעִימוֹת* *אֱמוֹנָה* *נְפִלְאוֹת* wonderful things, Ex 34¹⁰ and frequently *קָשׁוֹת* hard things, roughly, Gn 42^{7.50} (but cf. also *רִיקִים* vain things, Pr 12¹¹, 28¹⁹). Cf. moreover, the very frequent use of *זֹאת*, *הִיא* (as well as *זֶה* and *הֵוא*), Ju 14⁴, *ψ* 118²³, &c., in the sense of *hoc, illud* (also *הֵנָּה* equivalent to *illa*, Is 51¹⁹): also the use of the feminine form of the verb in Is 7⁷ *לֹא תִהְיֶה וְלֹא תָקוּם* it shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass; Ju 14⁴¹, Jer 10⁷; so too the suffixes Gn 15⁶, Ex 10¹¹, Jb 38¹⁸, referring back to a whole statement.²

(b) Titles and designations of office, properly a subdivision of the abstract *r* ideas treated above, under *g*, and specially noticed here only on account of their peculiar transference to concrete male persons. Thus we have *קֹהֵלֶת* Ec 1¹, &c. (as a title of Solomon), properly no doubt that which takes part in or speaks in a religious assembly, hence LXX *ἐκκλησιαστής*, i.e. *concionator, preacher*; the proper names *סֹפֶרֶת* Ezr 2⁵⁵, Neh 7⁵⁷, and *פִּכְרֶת* Ezr 2⁵⁷, Neh 7⁵⁹, and the foreign word *פַּחָה* viceroy; in the plural *כְּנוֹת* prop. *cognomina*, then like-named, colleagues; *פְּרָעוֹת* princes (if this be the true meaning).³ All these words, in accordance with their meaning, are construed as masculine (in Ec 7²⁷ instead of *אִמְרָה* the words should rather be divided as *הַקֵּן אִמְרָה*; cf. 12⁸).

¹ Cf. the list of masculine and feminine abstracts in Albrecht, l.c., 1896, p. 111 ff.

² While in all these instances it is simplest to speak of the feminine in Hebrew as being used for the neuter (which in Latin, Greek, and German is commonly employed for similar purposes), it must yet not be forgotten that since the language is wholly wanting in *neuters*, the Semitic mind regarded the above-mentioned forms primarily as actual feminines. Hence the Arab commentators are accustomed to explain the feminines of adjectives and participles (which would be neuter in Latin, &c.) by supplying a feminine substantive.

³ This use of the feminine form is far more frequent in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Aramaic; cf. e.g. in Arabic *ḥalīfa* (fem. from *ḥalīf*, following after, taking the place of) in the sense of the successor or representative (of Muḥammad), and *‘allāma* (great wisdom) as a title of learned men. Analogous to this is the Latin *magistratus, magistracy*, for *magistrate*, and our *his Majesty, Excellency, Highness, &c.*

S Abstract ideas include also—

(c) *Collectives* in the fem. form,¹ generally fem. participles used substantively, especially as the comprehensive designation of a number of persons, e. g. אֲרֻחָה (fem. of travelling), prop. the travelling (company), i. e. travelling persons (a caravan); גִּזְלוֹה (fem. of גָּזַל one going into exile) the company of exiles (also frequently used of those who had returned home again); יוֹשְׁבֵת (that which inhabits) i. e. the population, Is 12⁶, Mi 1^{11 f.}; אֹיֶבֶת (prop. that which is hostile) the enemy, Mi 7^{8,10} (cf. Mi 4^{6 f.} the halting, cast off, driven away, i. e. those who halt, &c.); דָּלוֹה (the abject) the poorest sort; of living beings which are not persons, cf. חַיָּה (that which lives) in the sense of cattle, beasts; דְּגָהּ a shoal of fish, Gn 1²⁶ (but in Jon 2² as a *nomen unitatis*, cf. t, for דָּג a fish, which in verses 1 and 11 is used as the *nomen unitatis*). Cf., moreover, נִבְלָה dead body, Is 26¹⁹, &c. (construed as masculine), for a heap of dead bodies.—On the collective poetic personification of a nation, by means of בַּת daughter, in בַּת עַמִּי, בַּת בָּבֶל (equivalent to עַמִּי בְנֵי) my countrymen, see above, i.

t (d) Conversely the feminine form of substantives is sometimes used (as in Arabic) as a *nomen unitatis*, i. e. to indicate a single example of a class which is denoted by the masculine form; cf. אֲנִי a fleet (1 K 9²⁶), אֲנִיָּה a single ship (Jon 1^{3 ff.}); צִיד hunting, game, צִידָה Gn 27³ Keth. (צִידָה Q^{erê}) a piece of venison; שֵׁנַר hair (coll.), שֵׁנָה a single hair (Ju 20¹⁸; in the plural, ψ 40¹³, 69⁵); שִׁיר a poem, frequently collective, שִׁירָה a single song; so probably also תֵּאֱנָה a fig (the corresponding masculine תֵּן is collective in Arabic); שֹׁשַׁנָּה a lily (also שֹׁשַׁן); לִבְנָה a brick (Arab. libina, but libin collective), &c.

u (e) The feminine is also used for things without life (as being weaker or less important), which are named from their resemblance to organic things expressed by the corresponding masculine form; cf. זֶרֶךְ side (of the body), thigh, יֶרֶכָה or יִרְכָּה back part, border (of a country, house, &c.); מִצְחָה forehead, מִצְחָה greaves. On a similar distinction between the masculine for natural, and the feminine for artificial objects, see § 87 a.

v Rem. The juxtaposition of the masculine and feminine from the same stem serves sometimes to express entirety; e. g. Is 3¹ מִשְׁעָנָה וּמִשְׁעָנָה stay and staff, i. e. every kind of support (unless we omit verse 1^b as a gloss and take staff as = staff-bearer, official; the list of officials begins in verse 2); cf. Is 16⁶, Pr 8¹³. For similar groupings in the case of persons, see Is 43⁶, 49²², 60⁴ (sons and daughters); 49²³, Ec 2⁸.

§ 123. The Representation of Plural Ideas by Means of Collectives, and by the Repetition of Words.

a Besides the plural endings treated in § 87 a-i, the language employs other means to express a plurality of living beings or things:

(a) Certain words employed exclusively in a collective sense, while the individual members of the class are denoted by special words (*nomina unitatis*, but not in the same sense as in § 122 t).

¹ Cf. in Greek ἡ ἵππος, the cavalry (as well as τὸ ἵππικόν), ἡ κάμηλος, Hdt. 1, 80, &c., the camel corps.

Thus **בָּקָר** *cattle, oxen*¹ (even joined with numerals, e.g. Ex 21³⁷ **חֲמִשָּׁה בָּקָר** *five head of cattle*), but **שֹׂר** *an ox*; **צֹאן** *small cattle*, i.e. sheep and goats (*μῆλα*), cf. Jb 1³ **שִׁבְעַת אֲלֵפֵי-צֹאן** *seven thousand sheep*; but **שֶׂה** *a single head of small cattle* (a sheep or a goat). Other more or less common collectives are: **זֵיוֹ** (prop. that which prowls or roams) *wild beasts*, **טָף** (perhaps prop. tripping) *a number of little children*; **רִשָּׁא** *fresh green herb*, i.e. young plants, **רֶקֶק** *green*, i.e. vegetation in general; **עוֹף** *birds, fowl*; **רֶכֶב** *chariots or cavalcade*, **רֶמָּה** *worms*, **רֶמֶשׁ** *creeping things* (of small creatures), **שָׂרִץ** *swarming things*.

(b) The collective use of substantives which at the same time serve *b* as *nomina unitatis*; thus, **אָדָם** (never in plur.) means both *man* (*homo*) and *men* (*homines*); **אִישׁ** *a man* (*vir*) and *men* (*viri*); **אִשָּׁה** *woman* and *women* (Ju 21¹⁶, 1 S 21⁶); **אַרְבֶּה** *a locust*, but usually *a swarm of locusts*; **נַפְשׁ** *soul* and *souls* (persons); **מַקֵּל** *staff* and *staves* (Gn 30³⁷); **עוֹט** *a bird of prey* and *birds of prey*; **עָלָה** *a leaf* and *foliage*; **עֵשֶׂב** *a plant* and *plants, herbs*; **עֵץ** *a tree* and *trees* (as it were *foliage*); **פֵּרִי** *fruit* and *fruits*; **שֵׁם** *a shrub* and *shrubs*; in isolated instances also nouns like **עֶבֶד** *man-servant*, **שִׁפְחָה** *maid-servant*, **חֲמֹר** *ass*, **שֹׂר** *ox* (cf. Gn 32⁶).—On the singular (especially of gentilic names) with the article (which may, however, be omitted in poetry, cf. e.g. ψ 12² **הַסִּיר**, Pr 11¹⁴ **יוֹעֵץ**) to include all individuals of the same species, cf. § 126 l. On the special meaning of the plurals formed from certain collectives, see § 124 l.

(c) The feminine ending; see § 122 s.

(d) The repetition of single words, and even of whole groups of *c* words, especially to express entirety, or in a distributive sense. The following cases are more particularly to be noticed:

1. The repetition of one or more words to express the idea of *every, all*, as **יוֹם יוֹם** Gn 39¹⁰, &c., *day by day, every day*; **שָׁנָה שָׁנָה** Dt 14²²; **אִישׁ אִישׁ** *every man*, Ex 36⁴; with **בְּ** before each, as **בְּבֹקֶר בְּבֹקֶר** Ex 16²¹ *every morning* (and similarly before a group of words, Lv 24⁸), for which the distributive **לְ** is also used, **לְבֹקֶר לְבֹקֶר** 1 Ch 9²⁷, and with one plural **לְבֹקְרִים** ψ 73¹⁴, **לְבֹקְרִים** Jb 7¹⁸ parallel with **לְרִנָּעִים** *every moment*. Somewhat different are the instances with **בְּ** before the second word only, e.g. **יוֹם בְּיוֹם** *day by day*, 1 Ch 12²²; **שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה** *year by year*, Dt 15²⁰, 1 S 17 (but in verse 3 **בְּשָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה**), **בְּפֶעַם בְּפֶעַם** Nu 24¹, Ju 16²⁰, 20^{30 f.}, 1 S 3¹⁰ *as at other times*. Also with the two words united by means of *wāw* copulative, **אִישׁ וְאִישׁ** ψ 87⁵, or **אִישׁ וְאִישׁ** Est 1⁸; **דּוֹר וְדּוֹר** *all generations*, Dt 32⁷; **יוֹם וְיוֹם** Est 3⁴; cf. Est 8⁹,

¹ The plural form **בָּקָרִים** from **בָּקָר** is found only in very late Hebrew, Neh 10³⁷ (where according to the Mantua edition, Ginsburg, &c., even **צֹאֲנֵינוּ** *our sheep*, is also to be read; Baer, however, has **צֹאֲנֵנוּ**), and 2 Ch 4³. In Am 6¹² read, with Hitzig, **בְּבֹקֶר יָם**.

Ezr 10¹⁴, 1 Ch 26¹³ and often (cf. Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, 1889, p. 479, according to whom the use of the 1 copulative with the second word is especially common in Ch and Est, and therefore belongs to the later language; Driver, *Introd.*⁶, p. 538, No. 35); sometimes (but with the exception of ψ 45¹⁸ only in very late passages) with a pleonastic בְּלִי preceding, ψ 145¹³, Est 2¹¹, 9²⁸, 2 Ch 11¹², &c.

- d 2. Repetition of words in an expressly distributive sense¹ (which may to some extent be noticed in the examples under c) equivalent to *one each*, &c., e. g. Nu 14³⁴ *forty days* יוֹם לְשָׁנָה יוֹם לְשָׁנָה counting for every day a year; cf. Ez 24⁶, Ex 28³⁴ (three words repeated); also with the addition of לְבַד apart, יָצָא לְבַדּוֹ every drove by itself, Gn 32¹⁷; cf. Ze 12¹². Most frequently with the addition of a numeral (for the simple repetition of numerals for the same purpose, cf. § 134 g), and with the words not only in groups of two (Lv 24⁸, Nu 13², 31⁴) or three (Nu 7¹¹, 17²¹), but even of six (Ex 26³) or seven (Ex 25³³, 26^{19, 21, 25}); in Ex 25³⁵ five words even three times repeated.²
- e 3. Repetition to express an exceptional or at least superfine quality; e. g. 2 K 25¹⁵ *which were of gold, gold, of silver, silver*, i. e. made of pure gold and pure silver; Dt 2²⁷ בְּדֶרֶךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ only along by the high way; cf. Nu 3⁸, 8¹⁶ *they are given, given to him*, i. e. given exclusively for his service, for his very own. Also with a certain hyperbole in such examples as 2 K 3¹⁶ גְּבִים גְּבִים nothing but trenches; Gn 14¹⁰ בְּאֵרֵת חֲמֹר בְּאֵרֵת all asphalt-pits.—Repetition serves to intensify the expression to the highest degree in Ju 5²² *by reason of the violent pransings of his strong ones*, Ex 8¹⁰ (countless heaps), and Jo 4¹⁴ (countless multitudes); cf. also מְעַט מְעַט Ex 23³⁰ *by little and little, very gradually*; cf. § 133 k.
- f 4. Repetition with the copula to express *of more than one kind*; thus Dt 25¹³ (Pr 20¹⁰) וָאֶבֶן וָאֶבֶן a weight and a weight, i. e. two kinds of weight (hence the addition *great and small*); ψ 12³ בְּלֵב וּבְלֵב with two kinds of heart, i. e. with a double-dealing heart; cf. the opposite לֵב לֵב בְּלֵא 1 Ch 12³³.

§ 124. The Various Uses of the Plural-form.³

- a 1. The plural is by no means used in Hebrew solely to express a number of individuals or separate objects, but may also denote them collectively. This use of the plural expresses either (a) a combination of various external constituent parts (plurals of *local extension*), or (b) a more or less intensive focusing of the characteristics inherent in the idea of the stem (*abstract plurals*, usually rendered in English by forms in *-hood*, *-ness*, *-ship*). A variety of the plurals described under (b), in which the secondary idea of *intensity* or of an *internal*

¹ Cf. in the New Testament St. Mark 6³⁹ f. συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ (Weizsäcker, *tischweise*, *beetweise*).

² These repetitions of larger groups of words belong entirely to the *Priestly Code* in the Pentateuch, and are unquestionably indications of a late period of the language. Of quite a different kind are such examples as Ez 16⁶, where the repetition of four words serves to give greater solemnity to the promise, unless here, as certainly in 1²⁰, it is a mere *ditlography*; the LXX omit the repetition in both passages.

³ Cf. Dietrich, 'Über Begriff und Form des hebr. Plurals,' in the *Abhandl. zur hebr. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 2 ff.

multiplication of the idea of the stem may be clearly seen, is (c) the *pluralis excellentiae* or *pluralis maiestatis*.

Examples of (a): Plurals of *local extension* to denote localities in general, but especially level surfaces (the *surface-plural*), since in them the idea of a whole composed of innumerable separate parts or points is most evident, as שָׁמַיִם (§ 88 d) *heaven* (cf. also מְרוֹמִים *heights of heaven*, Is 33¹⁶, Jb 16¹⁹; elsewhere מְרוֹם; מַיִם *water*; יָמִים (the broad surface of the sea) poetically for יָם *sea*; פָּנִים (prop. the side turned towards any one, then) *surface* in general, usually *face*; אַחֲרִים *the back*, Ex 26¹², 33²³, &c., צַוְאָרִים *neck, nape of the neck*¹; also מְרִאשׁוֹת *the place at the head*, מְרִגְלוֹת *place at the feet*; עֲבָרִים *place on the other side* (of a river); מַעְמָקִים *depth*, מְרַחֲקִים (also מְרַחֵק) *distance*, מִשְׁבָּבִים *bed*, Gn 49⁴ (unless, with Dillmann, it is to be explained in the sense of *double bed*, i.e. *torus*), מִשְׁבָּנִים ψ 46⁵, and מִשְׁבְּנוֹת 43³, 84², 132⁵, *dwelling* (perhaps also אֶהְלִים *encampment*, in passages like 1 S 4¹⁰). The last four belong, however, to poetic style, and are better reckoned amongst the *plurals of amplification* treated under d-f. So perhaps יַצְעִים *bed* (ψ 63⁷, Jb 17¹³; but Gn 49⁴, ψ 132³, &c., in the singular); probably, however, יַצְעִים (prop. *strata*) refers to a number of coverings or pillows.

The plural of extension is used to denote a lengthened period of time in עוֹלָמִים *eternity* (everlasting ages).

Rem. The plural of extension includes also a few examples which were C formerly explained as simply poetic plurals, e.g. Jb 17¹ לִי קְבָרִים *graves are* (ready) for me, i.e. the place where there are many of them (as it were the *graveyard*) is my portion, Jb 21³², 2 Ch 16¹⁴; cf. 2 K 22²⁰.

Of (b): the tolerably numerous abstract plurals, mostly of a particular d form (*qātūlīm, qitūlīm, &c.*), may be divided into two classes. They sum up either the *conditions* or *qualities* inherent in the idea of the stem, or else the various single acts of which an action is composed. Cf. for the first class, בְּחֹרִים and בְּחֹדֶת *youth*, זְקִנִים *old age*, נְעוּרִים *youth*; בְּתוּלִים *maidenhood*, בְּלִיָּלוֹת, *bridal state*; מְגוּרִים *condition of a sojourner*, בְּשָׂרִים *fleshliness* (only in Pr 14³⁰), חַיִּים *life* (the abstract idea of the qualities of a living being); שְׁבוּלִים *childlessness*, סְנוּרִים *blindness*, עוֹעִים *perverseness*.

There are also a number of plurals, found almost exclusively in poetry e (sometimes along with the singular), which are evidently intended to intensify² the idea of the stem (plural of amplification), as אוֹנִים *might*, Is 40²⁶; אֱמוּנִים (as well as אֱמוּנָה) and אֱמוּנוֹת *faithfulness*; אֲשֵׁרִי (according to § 93 l, only in the construct state plural or with suffixes = *the happiness of*), happy; בְּוִשְׁרוֹת (complete) *prosperity*, ψ 68⁷; בִּינּוֹת Is 27¹¹ and תְּבִינּוֹת Is 40¹⁴, &c. (keen) *understanding*; עֲצוֹת (true) *counsel*, Dt 32²⁸; דְּעִים Jb 37¹⁶ and דְּעוֹת

¹ Cf. the same use of the plural in τὰ στέρνα, τὰ ῥῶτα, τὰ πρᾶχyla, *praecordia, cervices, fauces*; on plurals of extension in general, cf. the propositions of place and time in the plur. form, § 103 n. סְפָרִים is not a case in point, in the sense of *letter* (properly a sheet folded into several pages; elsewhere also סֵפֶר) 1 K 21^{8 ff.}, 2 K 10¹, 19¹⁴ (Is 37¹⁴; referred to afterwards by the singular suffix); Is 39¹, Jer 29²⁵, 32¹⁴ (*after being folded, previously* סֵפֶר).

² Cf. A. Ember, 'The pluralis intensivus in Hebrew,' *AJSL*, 1905, p. 195 ff.

1 S 2³ (thorough) *knowledge*; בְּטָחוֹת Jb 12⁶ and מְבַטְחִים Is 32¹⁸ (full) *confidence*; בְּרֻכּוֹת (abundant) *blessing*, ψ 21⁷; גְּבוּרוֹת (exceptional) *strength*, Jb 41⁴; הוֹוֹת ψ 5¹⁰ (very) *wickedness*; חֲמוּדוֹת Dn 9²³ (greatly) *beloved*; חֲמוֹת ψ 76¹¹, &c. (fierce) *wrath*; חֲרָפוֹת Dn 12² (utter) *contempt*; יִשְׁעוֹת (real) *help*, Is 26¹⁸, &c.; מְרָאָה Gn 46² (an important) *vision*; מִישְׁרִים uprightness; תַּהֲפֻכּוֹת perversity; נִקְמוֹת (complete) *vengeance*, Ju 11³⁶, &c.; חֲשִׁכִּים and מְחֲשִׁכִּים (thick) *darkness*; מִסְתָּרִים a (close) *hiding-place*; נְדִיבִים nobility; שְׁמָנִים Is 28¹ *fatness*; צַחְצָחוֹת (complete) *aridity*; מְמַתְקִים sweetness; מְחַמְדִּים preciousness; נִשְׁעָשְׁעִים delight; עֲדָנִים and תַּעֲנִיגִים pleasure; רַחֲמִים compassion; מְנוּחָה ψ 23² *rest, refreshment*; מְהוּמָה Am 3⁹ *tumult*. Probably also יְדִידָה (heartfelt) *love*, ψ 45¹; מְרֻרוֹת (extreme) *bitterness*, Jb 13²⁶; מְרֻמוֹת (base) *deceit*, ψ 38¹³; צְדָקוֹת (true) *righteousness*, Is 33¹⁵, &c.; שְׂמֵחוֹת (the highest) *joy*, ψ 16¹¹. On the other hand, חֲכָמוֹת *wisdom* (Pr 1²⁰, &c.) can hardly be a plural (=the essence of wisdom, or wisdom personified), but is a singular (see § 86 l).

A further extension of this plural of amplification occurs according to P. Haupt's very probable suggestion (*SBOT. Proverbs*, p. 40, line 50, &c.) in יַאֲרִים the great river (of the Nile, generally יַאֲרֵךְ) Is 7¹⁸, 19⁶ (though with the predicate in the plural), Ez 30¹², ψ 78⁴⁴, but in Is 37²⁵, Ez 29³ the usual explanation, *arms or channels of the Nile*, can hardly be avoided; also in נְהָרוֹת ψ 24² of the ocean, which encircles the earth, 137¹ of the great river, i.e. the Euphrates, but in Is 18¹ נְהָרֵי כּוּשׁ is evidently a numerical plural.—In Pr 16¹³ מְלָכִים (acc. to P. Haupt=the great king) is very doubtful. In נְשִׂאֵי Ez 19¹ the second *yôdh* is evidently due to dittography, since יִשְׂרָאֵל follows.

f The summing up of the several parts of an action is expressed in הִנָּתִים embalming, בְּפָרִים atonement, מְלֵאִים (prop. filling, sc. of the hand) ordination to the priesthood, שְׁלָחִים dismissal, שְׁלָמִים retribution, פְּתָחִים engraving (of a seal, &c.); אֲהָבִים fornication, זִנוּנִים whoredom, נֶאֱפִים adultery; נַחֲמִים (prop. no doubt, warm compassion) consolation, תַּחֲנוּנִים supplication, נִדְרִים Jb 7⁴ (restless) tossing to and fro, עֲלָלוֹת gleaming; perhaps also נְיִינוֹת ψ 4¹, 6¹, &c., if it means the playing on stringed instruments, and שְׁלָמִים Is 12³ bribery, unless it be a plural of number.¹

g Of (c): the pluralis excellentiae or maiestatis, as has been remarked above, is properly a variety of the abstract plural, since it sums up the several characteristics² belonging to the idea, besides possessing the secondary sense of an intensification of the original idea. It is thus closely related to the plurals of amplification, treated under e, which are mostly found in poetry.

¹ Mayer Lambert in *REJ.* xxiv. 106 ff., enumerates no less than ninety-five words ending in *im*, which in his opinion are to be regarded as *pluralia tantum*.

² The Jewish grammarians call such plurals רְבֵי הַכּוֹחַ plur. *virium* or *virtutum*; later grammarians call them plur. *excellentie*, *magnitudinis*, or plur. *maiestaticus*. This last name may have been suggested by the *ue* used by kings when speaking of themselves (cf. already 1 Macc. 10¹⁹, 11³¹); and the plural used by God in Gn 1²⁶, 11⁷, Is 6⁸ has been incorrectly explained in this way. It is, however, either *communicative* (including the attendant angels; so at all events in Is 6⁸, cf. also Gn 3²²), or according to others, an indication of the fullness of power and might implied in אֱלֹהִים (see Dillmann on Gn 1²⁶); but it is best explained as a plural of self-deliberation. The use of the plural as a form of respectful address is quite foreign to Hebrew.

So especially אֱלֹהִים *Godhead, God* (to be distinguished from the numerical plural *gods*, Ex 12¹², &c.). The supposition that אֱלֹהִים is to be regarded as merely a remnant of earlier polytheistic views (i.e. as originally only a numerical plural) is at least highly improbable, and, moreover, would not explain the analogous plurals (see below). That the language has entirely rejected the idea of numerical plurality in אֱלֹהִים (whenever it denotes *one* God), is proved especially by its being almost invariably joined with a singular attribute (cf. § 132 *h*), e.g. אֱלֹהִים צַדִּיק ψ 7¹⁰, &c. Hence אֱלֹהִים may have been used originally not only as a numerical but also as an abstract plural (corresponding to the Latin *numen*, and our *Godhead*), and, like other abstracts of the same kind, have been transferred to a concrete single god (even of the heathen).

To the same class (and probably formed on the analogy of אֱלֹהִים) belong *h* the plurals קְדוּשִׁים *the Most Holy* (only of Yahweh), Ho 12¹, Pr 9¹⁰, 30³ (cf. אֱלֹהִים קְדוּשִׁים Jos 24¹⁹, and the Aram. עֲלִיּוֹנִין *the Most High*, Dn 7^{18.22.25}); and probably תְּרַפִּים (usually taken in the sense of *penates*) the image of a god, used especially for obtaining oracles. Certainly in 1 S 19^{13.16} only *one* image is intended; in most other places a single image *may* be intended¹; in Ze 10² alone is it most naturally taken as a numerical plural. In Ec 5⁷ גְּבוּהִים *supremus* (of God) is doubtful; according to others it is a numerical plural, *superiores*.

Further, אֲדָנִים, as well as the singular אֲדֹנָי (lordship) *lord*, e.g. אֲדָנִים קָשָׁה *a cruel lord*, Is 19⁴; אֲדָנִי הָאָרֶץ *the lord of the land*, Gn 42³⁰, cf. Gn 32¹⁹; so especially with the suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd persons אֲדָנֶיךָ, אֲדָנָיו ψ 45¹², אֲדָנָיו, &c., also אֲדָנָיו (except 1 S 16¹⁶); but in 1st sing. always אֲדָנִי.² So also בָּעָלִים (with suffixes) *lord, master* (of slaves, cattle, or inanimate things; but in the sense of *maritus*, always in the singular), e.g. בָּעָלָי Ex 21²⁰, Is 1³, &c.³

On the other hand, we must regard as doubtful a number of participles in *k* the plural, which, being used as attributes of God, resemble *plurales excellentiae*; thus, עֹשֵׂי *my Maker*, Jb 35¹⁰; עֹשֵׂי Is 54⁵; עֹשֵׂי ψ 149²; עֹשֵׂיָהּ Is 22¹¹; נֹטְיָהֶם *stretching them out*, Is 42⁵; for all these forms may also be explained as singular, according to § 93 ss.⁴—נֹשְׂאֵי Is 3¹² might also be regarded as another instance, unless it be a numerical plural, *their oppressors*; moreover, מְרַמֵּי *him who lifeth it up*, Is 10¹⁶ (but read probably מְרַמֵּי); שִׁלְחָיו *him who sendeth him*, Pr 10²⁶, 22²¹ (so Baer, but Ginsburg שִׁלְחָהּ), 25¹³ (in parallelism with אֲדָנָיו). These latter plurals, however (including מְרַמֵּי), may probably be more simply explained as indicating an indefinite individual, cf. *o* below.—For שֹׁמְרֵיךָ ψ 121⁵ (*textus receptus*) and בּוֹרְאֵיךָ Ec 12¹ (*textus receptus*) the singular should be read, with Baer.

¹ Even in Gn 31³⁴, notwithstanding the plural suffix in וְהַשֹּׂמֵם and עֲלֵיהֶם, since the construction of these abstracts as numerical plurals is one of the peculiarities of the E-document of the Hexateuch; cf. Gn 20¹³, 35⁷, and § 145 *i*.

² On אֲדָנִי (for אֲדָנִי) as a name of God, cf. § 135 *q*.

³ Euting, *Reise in Arabien*, p. 61, mentions the interesting fact that the subjects of the Emir of Hâyel commonly speak of their ruler as *šiyûkh*, a plur. majestatis = *the great sheikh*.

⁴ בָּעָלָהּ, which in Is 54⁵ is in parallelism with עֹשֵׂיךָ, must then be explained as merely formed on analogy.

l Rem. 1. (a) Coherent substances, &c., are mostly regarded as *single*, and are, accordingly, almost always represented by nouns in the singular, cf. אֶבֶק *fine dust*, אֶפֶר *ashes*, בֵּר *linen*, בְּדִיל *lead*, זָהָב *gold*, כֶּסֶף *silver*, נְחֹשֶׁת *brass*, חֵלֶב *milk*, יַיִן *wine*, עָפָר *dust*, the ground, עֵץ *wood*. Plurals are, however, formed from some of these words expressing materials in order to denote separate portions taken from the whole in manufacture (*plurals of the result*) or parts otherwise detached from it; thus, בְּדִים *linen garments*; כֶּסֶּפִּים *silver pieces*, Gn 42^{25, 35}; נְחֹשֶׁתַיִם (dual) *fetters of brass*; עֵצִים *ligna* (*timber for building or sticks for burning*); also in a wider sense, בְּדִילִים *particles of alloy* to be separated by smelting, Is 1²⁵; עֲפָרוֹת *fragments of earth*, Pr 8²⁶, cf. Jb 28⁶ עֲפָרֹת זָהָב *dust of gold*.

m (b) To the class of *plurals of the result* belong also a few names of natural products, when represented in an artificial condition; thus, חֲטָיִם *wheat* in grain (threshed wheat), as distinguished from חֹטֶה *wheat* (used collectively) in the ear; cf. the same distinction between בֶּכְמִים and בֶּכְמַת *spelt*; עֲרִישִׁים and עֲרִשָּׁה (the singular preserved only in the Mishna) *lentils*; שְׁעָרִים and שְׁעָרָה *barley*; also פְּשָׁתִים *linen*, פִּשֶׁת (to be inferred from פִּשְׁתִּי) *flax*.

n (c) Finally, the distinction between דָּם *blood* and דָּמִים requires to be specially noticed. The singular is always used when the blood is regarded as an organic unity, hence also of menstrual blood, and the blood of sacrifices (collected in the basin and then sprinkled), and in Nu 23²⁴ of the blood gushing from wounds. On the other hand, דָּמִים as a sort of plural of the result and at the same time of local extension, denotes *blood which is shed*, when it appears as blood-stains (Is 1¹⁵) or as blood-marks (so evidently in Is 9⁴). But since blood-stains or blood-marks, as a rule, suggest blood shed in murder (although דָּמִים also denotes the blood which flows at childbirth or in circumcision), דָּמִים acquired (even in very early passages) simply the sense of a *bloody deed*, and especially of *bloodguiltiness*, Ex 22^{1f.}, &c.

o In some few cases the plural is used to denote an indefinite singular; certainly so in Dt 17⁵ אֶל-שַׁעְרֶיךָ *unto one of thy gates*; Zc 9⁹ בְּיַאֲתָנוֹת (cf. Ct 2⁹); Ex 21²² יִלְדֶּיהָ (where evidently only *one* child is thought of, though certainly in connexion with a contingency which may be repeated); cf. also Ec 4¹⁰ (*if one of them fall*).—So probably also Gn 8⁴, 1 S 17⁴³, Dn 2¹, Neh 3⁸, 6²; but not Gn 19²⁹, since the same document (Gn 13¹²) makes Lot dwell *in the cities of the Jordan valley*; in Gn 21⁷ בָּנִים denotes the class with which the action is concerned. In Ju 12⁷ instead of the unusual בְּעָרֵי גִלְעָד *in the cities of Gilead* (formerly explained here as *in one of the cities of Gilead*) we should most probably read, with Moore (*SBOT. Judges*, p. 52), בְּעִירוֹ בְּמִצְפֵּה גִלְעָד *in his city, in Mizpeh (in) Gilead*.

p 2. When a substantive is followed by a genitive, and the compound idea thus formed is to be expressed in the plural, this is done—

(a) Most naturally by using the plural of the *nomen regens*, e.g. חֵיל גִּבּוֹרֵי *mighty men of valour* (prop. heroes of strength), 1 Ch 7^{2, 9}; so also in compounds, e.g. בְּנֵי יְמִינִי 1 S 22⁷, as the plur. of בְּנֵי-יְמִינִי *Benjamite*; but also

q (b) By using the plural of *both* nouns,¹ e.g. גִּבּוֹרֵי חֵילִים 1 Ch 7⁵;

¹ Cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 438 f., according to whom the plural of the principal word exercises an influence on the determining genitive.

שְׁנֵי-לֶחֶת אֲבָנִים and in prison houses, Is 42²²; cf. Ex 34¹, &c., two tables of stone (but Ex 31¹⁸ לֶחֶת אֶבֶן); Nu 13³², Dt 1²⁸, Jos 5², 6⁴, 2 K 14¹⁴, 25²³, Is 51⁹, Jer 41¹⁶, Ezr 3³, &c. עַמִּי הָאֲרָצוֹת the people of the country; 2 Ch 26¹⁴; so perhaps בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים sons of God, ψ 29¹, 89⁷ (according to others sons of gods); or finally even

(c) By using the plural of the *nomen rectum*; ¹ e. g. בֵּית אָבוֹת Ex 6¹⁴, r Nu 1^{2.4ff.}, &c., as plur. of בֵּית אָב father's house, family; בֵּית הַבָּמוֹת the houses of the high places, 2 K 17²⁹ (also בְּתֵי הַבָּמוֹת 23¹⁹); בֵּית עֲצִבְיָהֶם the houses of their idols, 1 S 31⁹, Ez 46²⁴; cf. also Ju 7²⁵ the head of Oreb and Zeeb, i. e. the heads, &c.

Rem. When a substantive (in a distributive sense) with a suffix refers S back to a plural, the singular form of the substantive suffices, since the idea of plurality is already adequately expressed by the suffix, e. g. בְּיָמָיו os (for ora) eorum, ψ 17¹⁰; יְמִינָם their right hand, ψ 144⁸ [so in the English RV.], for hands.

§ 125. Determination of Nouns in general. Determination of Proper Names.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 466 ff.

1. A noun may either be determinate in itself, as a proper name *a* or pronoun (see below, *d* and *i*), or be made so by its context. In the latter case, the determination may be effected either by prefixing the article (see § 126), or by the connexion of the noun (in the construct state) with a following determinate genitive, and consequently also (according to § 33 c) by its union with a pronominal suffix (§ 127 a). It is to be taken as a fundamental rule, that the determination can only be effected in *one* of the ways here mentioned; the article cannot be prefixed to a proper name, nor to a noun followed by the genitive, nor can a proper name be used in the construct state. Deviations from this rule are either only apparent or have arisen from a corruption of the text.

Rem. Only in a few passages is a noun made expressly *indeterminate* by the addition of אֶחָד in the sense of our indefinite article; cf. Ex 16⁹³, Ju 9⁶³, 13², 1 S 1¹, 7^{9.12}, 1 K 13¹¹, 19⁴, 20¹³, 22⁹, 2 K 4¹, 8⁶, 12¹⁰, Ez 8⁸, Dn 8³, 10⁵ (in 8¹³ אֶחָד קָדוֹשׁ i. e. *one*, viz. *a holy one*, is opposed to another).

It is further to be noticed, that in Hebrew the phenomenon sometimes C occurs, which the Arab grammarians call *indeterminateness for the sake of amplification*; e. g. Is 31⁸ and he shall flee מִפְּנֵי-חֶרֶב from a sword, i. e. from an irresistible sword (God's sword); cf. Is 28² בֵּיךְ; 2 S 6² נִשָּׁם; Ho 3¹ אִשָּׁה such a woman, without doubt to be referred to the Gomer mentioned in cap. 1;

¹ Cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 482.

Am 6¹⁴ גֹּיִם; פְּרָעָה 77¹⁶; Pr 21¹² צַדִּיק, if with Delitzsch it is to be referred to God; Jb 8¹⁰ מְלִים meaning *important words*, but in 15¹³ מְלִין *reproachful words*. Cf. on this point, § 117 g, note 3, and Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, ed. 4, p. 79.

d 2. Real *proper nouns*, as being the names of things (or persons) only *once* met with, are sufficiently determinate in themselves. Such names, therefore, as יְהוָה, דָּוִד, יַעֲקֹב, פְּנֵעַן, קָדֵם do not admit of the article,¹ nor can they be in the construct state. On the other hand, not only *gentilic* names (as denoting the *various* individuals belonging to the same class), but also all those proper names, of which the appellative sense is still sufficiently evident to the mind, or at least has been handed down from an earlier period of the language, frequently (often even as a rule) take the article (according to § 126 e), and may even be followed by a genitive.

e Examples. Like the above-mentioned proper names of individuals, countries, and cities, so also national names, which are identical in form with the name of the founder of the race (e.g. יִשְׂרָאֵל, אָדָם, מוֹאָב), are always determinate in themselves. Of gentilic names (e.g. הָעִבְרִי the *Hebrew*, הָעִבְרִים the *Hebrews*, Gn 40¹⁵; הַכְּנַעֲנִי the *Canaanite*) the plural פְּלִשְׁתִּים, even when meaning the *Philistines*, is generally used without the article (but in 1 S 4⁷, &c., הַפְּ); so always בְּפִתְתָרִים.—Evident appellatives (like such modern names as the *Hague*, le *Havre*) are הַגִּבְעָה the *hill*, in the construct state נְאֻמַּת שָׁאֵל, i. e. the *Gibeah* named after *Saul* to distinguish it from others; הָרְמָה the *height*; הֶעָי the *heap*; הַלְבָּנוֹן (prop. the *white mountain*) the *Lebanon*; הַיָּאֵר (prop. the *river*) the *Nile*, cf. Am 8⁸ כִּיאוֹר מִצְרַיִם like the *river of Egypt*; הַיַּרְדֵּן the *Jordan* (according to Seybold, *Millheil. und Nachr. des DPV.*, 1896, p. 11, probably the *drinking-place* [יֵרֵד, Arab. *warada*, meaning orig. to go down to drink]).

f Rem. 1. In a few instances original appellatives have completely assumed the character of real proper names, and are therefore used without the article; thus אֱלֹהִים *God*, to denote the one true God (as elsewhere יְהוָה) Gn 1¹ and so generally in this document of the Pentateuch up to Ex 6, elsewhere sometimes הָאֱלֹהִים *Gods* (cf. § 126 e); also the sing. אֱלֹהֵי *God*, עֲלִיּוֹן the *Most High*, and יְשׁוּבָה the *Almighty* never take the article.—Moreover, אָדָם *Adam* from Gn 5¹ onwards (previously in 2⁷, &c., הָאָדָם the *first man*); שָׂטָן *Satan*, 1 Ch 21¹ (but Ze 3¹, Jb 1⁶, &c., הַשָּׂטָן the *adversary*); cf. אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד the *tent of revelation* (i. e. the *tabernacle*), always without the article.

g To the class of nouns originally appellative, which the language regards

¹ Consequently, הַמְּנַשֶּׁה Dt 3¹³, Jos 1¹², &c. (in the *Deuteronomist*) in the combination שִׁבְטֵי הַמְּנַשֶּׁה (for which elsewhere מְנַשֶּׁה) is to be regarded not as a proper name but as a gentilic name (= the *tribe of the Manassites*), for which in Dt 29⁷ הַמְּנַשִּׁי is used, as in 10⁸ הַלֵּוִי the *tribe of the Levites*, and in Ju 18¹ הַדָּנִי the *tribe of the Danites*.—In Jos 13⁷ הַמְּנַשֶּׁה (like gentilic names in מְנַשֶּׁה) is even used adjectivally.

as proper names, and which consequently never take the article, belong also certain archaic words mostly used only by poets, such as *שְׁאוֹל* *Hades*, *תְּהוֹמֹת* *world*, *הַיָּם* *ocean*, of the body of water which encircles the earth, Gn 1², &c.; but Is 63¹³, *פְּתֵחוּ מַיִם בְּתֵהוֹמוֹתַי* *through the depths*, viz. of the Red Sea.¹

2. When nouns which the usage of the language always treats as proper names occasionally appear to be connected with a following genitive, this is really owing to an ellipse whereby the noun which really governs the genitive, i. e. the appellative idea contained in the proper name, is suppressed. So evidently in the case of *יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת* *Yahweh (the God) of hosts*; the fuller form *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת* 2 S 5¹⁰, &c., or *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַצְבָּאוֹת* Am 3¹³, &c., is a secondary expansion of the original *יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת*; *אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת* in *ψ* 59⁶, 80^{15,20}, 84⁹ is due to the mechanical substitution of *אֱלֹהֵי* for *יְהוָה* affected in the 2nd and part of the 3rd book of the Psalms. So also in geographical names such as *אֲרָם נְהָרַיִם* *Ur (the city) of the Chaldees*, Gn 11²⁸; *בֵּית לָחֶם יְהוּדָה* *Bethlehem (the city) of Judah*; *אָבֶל מַעֲכָה* 2 S 20¹⁴, &c., to distinguish it from *אָבֶל מַיִם* *Abel by the water*, 2 Ch 16⁴; *יִבְיִשׁ גִּלְעָד* 1 S 11¹, &c.; *יִרְדֵּן יְרֵחוֹ* Nu 22¹, 26^{3,63}, &c.; on Ju 8³² cf. § 128 c; *צִיּוֹן קְדוֹשׁ יְהוָה* *the Zion of the Holy One of Israel*, Is 60¹⁴; but in 1 S 1¹ for *צוֹפִים* read *צוֹפֵי* *a Zuphite*. Some of these examples (cf. also Am 6²) come very near to the actual construct state (cf. above, *נִבְעֵת שְׁאוֹל*), since e.g. the addition of the genitive serves to distinguish the place from four others called Aram (see the Lexicon), or from another Bethlehem. Aram, Bethlehem, &c., are accordingly no longer names found only in one special sense, and therefore also are no longer proper names in the strictest sense.

3. Of the pronouns, the personal pronouns proper (the separate *i* pronouns, § 32) are always determinate in themselves, since they can denote only definite individuals (the 3rd person, also definite things). For the same reason the demonstrative pronouns (§ 34) are also determinate in themselves, when they stand *alone* (as equivalent to substantives), either as subject (Gn 5²⁹) or as predicate (e.g. *זֶה הַיּוֹם* *this is the day*, Ju 4¹⁴; *אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים* *these are the words*, Dt 1¹), or as object (e.g. *אֶת־זֹאת* 2 S 13¹⁷), or as genitive (*זֶה מְחִיר* 1 K 21²), or finally when joined to a preposition (*לְזֹאת* Gn 2²³; *בְּזֶה* 1 S 16⁸, see § 102 g).

So also the personal pronouns *הוּא*, *הִיא*, *הֵם*, *הֵנָּה*, *הֵנָּה* when they *h* are used as demonstratives (= *is, ea, id, ille, &c.*) are always determinate in themselves, e.g. *הוּא הַדָּבָר* *that is the thing*, Gn 41²⁸. They

¹ That various other words, such as *אָנוֹשׁ* *man*, *צִלְמָוֹת* *deep darkness*, *רֹן* *prince*, *שָׂדֵי* *field*, *תְּנוּשָׁה* *effectual working*, are always found without the article is not to be attributed to any special archaism, but is to be explained from the fact that they belong solely to poetic language, which avoids the article; in other cases, such as *תְּרִמְכָה* *deep sleep*, there is no occasion for the article in the passages we possess.

are made determinate by the article, when they are joined like adjectives (see § 126 *u*) with a determinate substantive, e.g. הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה *this man*; הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה *these men*; וּבָעֵת הַהִוא *in those days, and in that time*, Jo 4¹. The demonstrative, however, even in this case, is frequently used *without* the article, as being sufficiently determinate in itself (cf. § 126 *y*).

§ 126. Determination by Means of the Article.

a 1. The article (הַ, הָ, הֵ, § 35) was originally, as in other languages (clearly in the Romance; cf. also *ὁ, ἡ, τό* in Homer), a demonstrative pronoun. The demonstrative force of the article, apart from its occasional use as a relative pronoun (see § 138 *i*), appears now, however, only (*a*) in a few standing phrases, and (*b*) in a certain class of statements or exclamations.

b (*a*) Cf. הַיּוֹם *this day, hodie* (§ 100 *c*); הַלַּיְלָה *this night*, Gn 19³⁴; הַפֶּעַם *this time*, Gn 2²³; הַשָּׁנָה *this year (= in this year)* Is 37³⁰, Jer 28¹⁶.

(*b*) includes those instances in which the article, mostly when prefixed to a participle, joins on a new statement concerning a preceding noun. Although such participles, &c., are no doubt primarily regarded always as in apposition to a preceding substantive, the article nevertheless has in some of these examples almost the force of הַיּוֹם (הֵיאָה, הֵפֶה) as the subject of a noun-clause; e.g. ψ 19¹⁰ *the judgements of the Lord are true . . .*, verse 11 הַנְּחָמָדִים וְגו' *prop. the more to be desired than gold, i.e. they are more to be desired, or even they, that are more to be desired,*¹ &c.; cf. Gn 49²¹, Is 40²²¹, 44²⁷¹, 46⁶, Am 2⁷, 5⁷, ψ 33¹⁵, 49⁷ הַבְּמֹתִים in the parallel half of the verse continued by a finite verb); ψ 104³, Jb 6¹⁶, 28⁴, 30³, 41²⁵ and frequently. When such a participle has another co-ordinate with it, the latter is used *without* the article, since according to the above it strictly speaking represents a second predicate, and as such, according to *i*, remains indeterminate; e.g. Jb 5¹⁰ *who giveth* (הַנִּתֵּן) *rain, &c., and sendeth* (וְשִׁלַּח), &c.

C The article is sometimes used with similar emphasis before a substantive, which serves as the subject of a compound sentence (§ 140 *d*); e.g. Dt 32⁴ הַצֹּר תָּמִים פֶּעֶלּוֹ i.e. as a fresh statement (not in apposition to the preceding dative), really equivalent to *he is a rock, perfect in his work* (i.e. *whose work is perfect*); cf. ψ 18³¹.

d 2. The article is, generally speaking, employed to determine a substantive wherever it is required by Greek and English; thus:

(*a*) When a person or thing already spoken of is mentioned again, and is consequently more definite to the mind of the hearer or reader; e.g. Gn 1³ *and God said, Let there be light*: verse 4 *and God saw the light* (אֶת־הָאוֹר); 1 K 3²⁴ *fetch me a sword: and they brought the sword*; Ec 9¹⁵. (In 2 S 12² therefore לַעֲשִׂיר must be read.)

¹ On the analogous use of the article before participles which have a verbal suffix, as in ψ 18³³, &c., cf. above, § 116 *f*.

(b) With a title understood and recognized by every one, e. g. *הַפֶּלֶךְ הַשְּׂמֹנֶה* ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμών: Gn 35⁸ *under the oak* (the well-known oak which was there).

(c) With appellatives to denote persons or natural objects which are unique, e. g. *הַגָּדוֹל הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל* the high priest, *הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ* the sun, *הָאָרֶץ* the earth.

(d) When terms applying to whole classes are restricted (simply by *e* usage) to particular individuals (like ὁ ποιητής, meaning Homer) or things, e. g. *שָׂטָן* adversary, *הַשָּׂטָן* the adversary, Satan; *בָּעַל* lord, *הַבָּעַל* Baal as proper name of the god; *הָאָדָם* the (first) man, Adam; *הָאֱלֹהִים*¹ or *הָאֵל* ὁ θεός, the one true God (cf. also ὁ Χριστός in the New Testament); also *הַנָּהָר* the river, i. e. Euphrates; *הַכֶּכֶּר* the circle, sc. of the Jordan, the Jordan plain [Gn 19¹⁷, &c.].

(e) Very often with the vocative, e. g. 2 S 14⁴ *הַפֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל* help, O king; Zc 3⁸ *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל* O Joshua the high priest; 1 S 17⁵⁸, 24⁹, 2 K 9⁵; in the plural, Is 42¹⁸, Jo 1^{2.13}; but cf. also Jos 10¹², Is 1², 49¹³ (*שָׂמַיִם* and *אָרֶץ*); 23¹⁶, Ho 13¹⁴, Jo 1⁵, ψ 34¹², Ec 10¹⁷, 11⁹, &c.² The vocative occurs *without* the article in Is 22², since it has been already defined by a preceding accusative.

Rem. Strictly speaking in all these cases the substantive with the article *f* is really in apposition to the personal pronoun of the 2nd person, which is either expressly mentioned or virtually present (in the imperative), e. g. 1 S 17⁵⁸ *thou, the young man*. But such passages as Is 42¹⁸, where the vocative precedes the imperative, prove that in such cases the substantive originally in apposition eventually acquired the value of a complete clause.

(f) With words denoting classes (see particulars under *l*).

(g) In a peculiar way, to specify persons or things, which are so far definite as to be naturally thought of in connexion with a given case, and must be assumed accordingly to be there (see *q-s*).

(h) With adjectives (also ordinal numbers and demonstrative pronouns used adjectivally) which are joined to substantives determined in some way (see *u*).

Rem. The article may be omitted in *poetry* in all the above-mentioned *h* cases; in general it is used in poetry far less frequently than in prose. Its use or omission probably often rests on rhythmical grounds;³ it is sometimes omitted also for rhetorical reasons. Cf. e. g. *אֶרֶץ* for *הָאֶרֶץ* ψ 2²; *מַלְכִים* as vocative, verse 10; *מֶלֶךְ* for *הַמֶּלֶךְ* 21²; *וְנֹרָא* *נִדְוֹל* (contrary to *u*, *v*) 99³. In the instances in which the ה of the article is omitted after a prefix (§ 35 *n*), the vowel of the article is often retained after the prefix even in poetry, e. g. *בְּשָׂמַיִם* ψ 24, &c.

¹ On the subsequent change of *שָׂטָן*, *אָדָם*, *אֱלֹהִים* into real proper names by the omission of the article, cf. above, § 125 *f*.

² For further exceptions see Nestle, ZAW. 1904, p. 323 ff.

³ Cf. the useful statistics of J. Ley in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, 2te Abteilung, 1891, Heft 7-9, and M. Lambert, 'L'article dans la poésie hébr.', REJ. 37, 263 ff.

i (i) On the other hand, the article is always omitted when a person or thing is to be represented as indefinite (or indefinable) or as yet unknown; consequently also before the predicate, since this is from its nature always a general term, under which the subject is included, e.g. Gn 29⁷ עוֹר הַיּוֹם גָּדוֹל *as yet the day is great*, i.e. it is yet high day; 33¹³, 40¹⁸, 41²⁶, Is 66³.

k Rem. 1. As exceptions to the above rule it is usual to regard those examples in which a determinate adjective or participle (equivalent to a relative clause) is used apparently as a predicate, e.g. Gn 2¹¹ הוּא הַפֶּסֶב *it is the compassing*, i.e. *that is it which compasseth*; 42⁶, 45¹², Ex 6²⁷, Dt 3²¹, 8¹⁸, 11⁷, 1 S 4¹⁶, Is 14²⁷, Mal 3² (cf. in Greek, e.g. St. Mat. 10²⁰, where Winer, *Gram. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, § 58, 2, Rem., explains οἱ λαλοῦντες as a predicate with the article). In reality, however, these supposed predicates are rather subjects (acc. to § 116 q), and the only peculiarity of these cases is that the subject is not included under a general idea, but is equated with the predicate.

2. Sometimes the article is used with only one of two parallel words, as Na 1⁵ הָרִים וְהַנְּבָעוֹת, 2 Ch 3¹⁷ מִיָּמִין וּמִשְׁמָאל.

l 3. The use of the article to determine the *class* is more extensive in Hebrew than in most other languages. In this case the article indicates universally known, closely circumscribed, and therefore well defined classes of persons or things. The special cases to be considered are—

m (a) The employment of general names as collectives in the singular, to denote the *sum total* of individuals belonging to the class (which may, however, be done just as well by the plural); e.g. *the righteous, the wicked man*, Ec 3¹⁷; *the woman*, i.e. *the female sex*, 7²⁶; הָאֹיֵב *the enemy*, i.e. *the enemies* (?) ψ 9⁷; הָאֹרֵב *the liar in wait*, i.e. *the liars in wait*; הַחֲלָיִין *the armed man*, i.e. *soldiers*; הַמֵּאַפֵּף *the rearguard*; הַפִּישְׁחִית *the spoiler*, 1 S 13¹⁷,¹ so also (as in English) with names of animals, when something is asserted of them, which applies to the whole species, e.g. 2 S 17¹⁰ *as the courage of הָאֲרִיָּה the lion*. Especially also with gentile names, e.g. *the Canaanite*, Gn 13⁷ (cf. 15^{19c}); so in English *the Russian, the Turk*, &c., in Attic writers ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, ὁ Συρακόσιος, &c.

n (b) Names of materials known everywhere, the elements and other words denoting classes, even though only a part and not the whole of them is considered, in which case in other languages, as e.g. in English, the article is usually omitted (cf., however, *our to fall into the water, into the fire*, &c.), e.g. Gn 13² *and Abram was very rich בַּמָּקֵנָה בַּכֶּסֶף וּבַזָּהָב in cattle, in silver and in gold*; Jos 11⁹ *and he burnt their chariots בָּאֵשׁ with fire*; cf. Gn 6¹⁴, 41⁴² (unless this means, *the chain necessarily belonging to the official dress*); Ex 2³, 31⁴ (35³²), Is 1²², &c, and בַּשֶּׁמֶן *with oil*² very commonly in the sacrificial laws, Ex 29²,

¹ But in Ex 12²³ הַמֹּר is either to be explained as *the destroyer* (now mentioned for the first time) according to q, or a particular angel is meant whose regular function it was to inflict punishments. Others again take הַמֹּר even in Ex 14²³ impersonally = *destruction*.

² In nearly all the above examples the presence of the article is only indicated by the vowel of the prefix (אֵ, אַ, אֱ) and might therefore be merely

&c., and also Dt 33²⁴, 2 S 1²¹, Is 1⁶, ψ 23⁵, &c. Similarly the article is used with terms of measurement, as הָאֶפָה Ex 16³⁶, &c.: הַחֹמֶר and הַבֵּת Ez 45¹¹; הָעֵמֶר Ex 16²²; בְּחֶבֶל 2 S 8².

(c) The expression of abstract ideas of every kind, since they are likewise used to represent whole classes of attributes or states, physical or moral defects, &c.; e.g. Pr 25⁵ (בְּצִדָק); Gn 19¹¹ and they smote the men . . . בְּפִגְמוֹת with blindness; Am 4⁹, &c.; but in הַחֹשֶׁן Is 60² the article is no doubt due to dittography of the ה, and the parallel וְעֶרְפֶּל has no article.

(d) Comparisons, since the object compared is treated not (as usually in O English) individually but as a general term, e.g. Is 1¹⁸ white בְּשֵׁלֶג as snow, בְּצֹמֶר as wool; red בְּחוֹלֶעַת like crimson; Is 34⁴ and the heavens shall be rolled together בְּפֶפֶר as a scroll; cf. Nu 11¹², Ju 8¹³, 16⁹ as פְּתִיל־הַנְּעֹתָה a string of tow is broken; 1 S 26²⁰, 1 K 14¹⁵, Is 10¹⁴, 24²⁰, 27¹⁰, 29⁸, 53⁶, Na 3¹⁵, ψ 33⁷, 49¹⁵; cf. also such examples as Gn 19²⁸, Ju 14⁶, where the object compared is determined by a determinate genitive which follows (according to § 127 a).

Examples of indeterminate comparisons are rare, and perhaps due only to the Masora,—so at least in the case of singulars, while in such plurals as those in Gn 42³⁰, 1 K 10²⁷, Jo 2^{4.7}, the omission of the article may be explained by the ordinary rules. On the other hand, the article is regularly omitted when the object compared is already defined by means of an attribute (or relative clause, Jer 23⁹, ψ 17¹²), e.g. Is 16² בְּעוֹף נוֹדָד קִן מְשֻׁלַּח as wandering birds, (as) a scattered nest (but cf. 10¹⁴ בְּפִנָּן); 14¹⁹, 29⁵ בְּמֵיץ עֵבֶר (but ψ 1⁴ בְּפִינָא); Jer 23⁰, Pr 27⁸, Jb 29²⁵, 30¹⁴.—In comparisons with persons also the Masora seems to avoid the use of the article, as in בְּנִבְבוֹר Jb 16¹⁴ and seven other places (בְּנִבְבוֹר only in Is 42¹³), בְּאָב Jb 31¹⁸, בְּנִבְבֹּר Jb 38⁸, 40⁷.

4. Peculiar to Hebrew¹ is the employment of the article to denote *q* a single person or thing (primarily one which is as yet unknown, and therefore not capable of being defined) as being present to the mind under given circumstances. In such cases in English the indefinite article is mostly used.

Thus Am 5¹⁹ as if a man did flee from a lion (הַאֲרִי, i.e. the particular lion *q* pursuing him at the time), and a bear (הַדִּב) met him, &c., cf. 3¹², 1 K 20³⁶ (John 10¹²); also Gn 8^{7.1}, 14¹³ הַפְּלִיט, i.e. one that had escaped, the particular one who came just then; so also Ez 24²⁶, 33²¹; cf. 2 S 15¹³); Gn 15^{1.11}, 18⁷ the servant, who is regarded as being constantly at hand and awaiting his commands; cf. 2 S 17¹⁷ (but הַנֶּעֱרַר Nu 11²⁷ is used like הַפְּלִיט above); Gn 19³⁰, unless בְּמַעְרָה means in the well-known cave; בְּמָקוֹם Gn 28¹¹, according to Dillmann, upon the place suitable for passing the night, or the right place, but it may possibly also refer to the sanctuary of Bethel afterwards so sacred and celebrated; Gn 42²³, 46², 50²⁶, Ex 2¹⁵, 3², 4²⁰, 21²⁰ (2 S 23²¹), Lv 23⁴², 24¹⁰ (Samaritan יִשְׂרָאֵל without the article); Nu 17¹¹, 21^{6.9}, 25⁶, Dt 19⁵, Jos 2¹⁵, Ju 4¹⁸, 8²⁵, 13¹⁹, 16¹⁹, 19²⁹, 20¹⁶, 1 S 17³⁴, 19¹³, 21¹⁰, 2 S 17¹⁷, 1 K 6⁸, 13¹⁴ (? most

due to the masoretic punctuation. There is, however, no reason to doubt the correctness of the tradition. The same is true of the examples under *n* and *o*.

¹ Cf., however, analogous examples in biblical Aramaic in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 79 f, e.g. Dn 2¹⁴, 3², &c.

probably a particular tree is meant); 19⁹, Is 7¹⁴ הָעֵלְמָה, i.e. *the particular maiden*, through whom the prophet's announcement shall be fulfilled; we should say *a maiden* [cf. Driver on 1 S 14, 6⁸, 10¹³]; Jb 9⁸¹.

s So always to write in the book (or on the scroll, Nu 5²³, Jer 32¹⁰), i.e. not in the book already in use, but in the book which is to be devoted to that purpose, equivalent to *in a book, on a scroll*, Ex 17¹⁴, 1 S 10²⁵, Jb 19²³. Especially instructive for this use of the article is the phrase יוֹמֵי הַיּוֹם, which does not simply refer back to the previous narrative in the sense of *the same day*, but is used exactly like our *one day* (properly meaning on the particular day when it happened, i.e. on a certain day), 1 S 14, 14¹, 2 K 4⁸, 11¹⁸, Jb 16¹³. In Gn 39¹¹ even בְּהַיּוֹם הַהוּא.

t The article is sometimes used in this way before collectives in the singular, which are not meant to denote (like the examples given under *i*) a whole class, but only that part of it which applies to the given case; thus הָעָרֶב, הַיּוֹנָה Gn 8⁷, הַצִּרְעָה Ex 23²³.

u 5. When a substantive is defined by the article, or by a suffix, or by a following genitive determinate in any way (see the examples below), the attribute belonging to it (whether adjective, participle, ordinal, or demonstrative pronoun) necessarily takes the article (see, however, the Rem.), e.g. Gn 10¹² הָעִיר הַגְּדוֹלָה *the great city*; Dt 3²⁴ יָד הַחֲזָקָה *thy strong hand*. A genitive following the substantive may, according to § 127 *a*, be determined either by the article, e.g. 1 S 25²⁵ אִישׁ הַבָּלְעֵל הַזֶּה *this worthless man* (prop. *man of worthlessness*; cf. also such examples as 2 Ch 36¹⁸, where the article is prefixed only to a second genitive following the noun); or as a proper name, e.g. Dt 11⁷ מַעֲשֵׂה יְהוָה הַגָּדֹל *the great work of the Lord*; or by a suffix, e.g. Is 36⁹ עֲבָדֵי אֲדָנִי הַקְּטַנִּים *the least of my master's servants*.

v When several attributes (whether connected by *Wāw* or not) follow a determinate substantive, each of them takes the article, e.g. Dt 10¹⁷ הָאֵל הַגָּדֹל הַחֲזָק וְהַנּוֹרָא *the great God, the mighty, and the terrible*. Cf. also Ex 3³, Dt 1¹⁹, in both of which places a demonstrative with the article also follows the adjective.¹

Rem. 1. The article is, however, not infrequently used also—

w (a) With the attribute alone, when it is added to an originally indefinite substantive as a subsequent limitation; so always with ordinal numbers after יוֹם,² e.g. Gn 1⁵¹ (cf. 2³, Ex 20¹⁰, &c.) יוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי *the sixth day* (prop. *a day namely*

¹ The demonstrative used adjectivally is generally placed *after* the adjective proper; in such cases as עֵמָךְ הָיָה הַגָּדֹל 2 Ch 1¹⁰ the adjective forms a further (fresh) addition to הָיָה.

² Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, 3rd ed., § 209; M. Lambert, *REJ.* 31, 279 f.—The omission of the article from the substantive is not to be regarded in *this* instance as an indication of late style, and consequently cannot be put forward as a proof of the late origin of the 'Priestly Code' (cf. Dillmann on Gn 1⁵¹, Holzinger, *Einl. in d. Hexateuch*, p. 465, and especially Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, xi. 229 f., against Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 265 f.). On the other hand, the common omission of the article from the substantive before a determinate adjective (e.g. הַגָּדֹל הַקָּדוֹשׁ *the great synagogue*, in the Mishna; cf. Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, p. 19 ff.) is certainly a later idiom.

the sixth; but יוֹם שֵׁנִי a second day, Gn 1⁸; Ex 12¹⁵ מִיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן from the first day onward (not before Dn 10¹² and Neh 8¹⁸ is מִיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן used instead of it). On the other hand, the article is *always* found after בְּ, hence בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁשִׁי, &c., although it is possible that the original reading in these cases was בְּיוֹם, and that the article is only due to the Masora. In Ju 6²⁵ the text is evidently corrupt (see verse 26).—Especially also in certain frequently recurring combinations as in particularizing the gates in Jer 38¹⁴, Ez 9², &c., Zc 14¹⁰, and courts in 1 K 7^{8,12}, &c., Ez 40²⁸; and very often when the attribute consists of a participle, e.g. Dt 2²³, Ju 21¹⁹, 1 S 25¹⁰, Jer 27³, 46¹⁶ חֶרֶב הַיּוֹנָה the sword which oppresses (?); Ez 14²², Zc 11² Keth. (the impenetrable forest?) Pr 26¹⁸, ψ 119²¹.

Of the other examples, Gn 21²⁹ (where, however, the Samaritan reads אֲחִי הַחֲבָשׁוֹת), 41²⁶ (but cf. verse 4), Nu 11²⁵, Ju 16²⁷, 1 S 17¹⁷ may at any rate be explained on the ground that the preceding cardinal number is equivalent to a determinant; in Gn 1²¹, 28^{9,10}, &c., the substantive is already determined by כָּל־, and in 1 S 14²⁹ (דִּבְשׁ) by מַעֲט.—In 1 S 12²³, 2 S 12⁴, Is 7²⁰ (where, however, הַשְּׁכִירָה might also be understood as a subsequent explanation of בְּחָעָר) and Neh 9³⁵, the omission of the article after the preposition is certainly due merely to the Masora. In 1 S 16²³ (unless רִיחַ אֱלֹהִים is to be read twice), Zc 4⁷ (where however אֶת הָהָר is probably meant), ψ 104¹⁸ (where a ה precedes הָרִים, hence probably a case of haplography), the omission of the article before אֶ, ר (?) and ה may be due to a regard for euphony (see *z* below). On the other hand, in 1 S 6¹⁸ (read הַיָּאֲבֹן הַגִּי, 17¹² הַיּוֹה is a later addition), 19²² (cf. the LXX), Jer 17², 32¹⁴, 40⁵ Keth., Ez 2³ (read גֹּי or omit גֹּיִם with Cornill), Mi 7¹¹, ψ 62⁴, either the text is corrupt, or the expression incorrect. But in 2 K 20¹³, Jer 6²⁰, Ct 7¹⁰ acc. to D. H. Müller (*Anzeiger der Wiener Akad.*, phil.-hist. Kl. 1902, no. x) הַטּוֹב is the genitive of a substantive, aromatic oil, sweet cane (in Jer 6²⁰ read וְקִנְיָה, like spiced wine. In Is 39² read כְּשֶׁמֶן הַטּוֹב and in ψ 133² כְּשֶׁמֶן הַטּוֹב).

(b) No article with the attribute, while the substantive is determined *y* either by the article, or a suffix, or a following genitive. Thus the article is sometimes omitted with demonstratives, since they are already to a certain extent determined by their meaning (cf. also the Mēša' inscription, l. 3, הַבְּמָת זֹאת this high place); as with הוּא Gn 19³³ (evidently for euphony, and so probably often); 30¹⁶, 32²³, 1 S 19¹⁰; with הִיא Gn 38²¹; with זֶה ψ 12⁸ (according to the Masora זֶה is a relative pronoun here, as always elsewhere); with אֵלֶּה 1 S 2²³, according to the present corrupt text (the original reading כָּל־עַם יְהוָה became כָּל־עַם אֱלֹהִים, and אֱלֹהִים was then corrupted to אֵלֶּה); so, almost without exception, when the substantive is determined only by a suffix, e.g. Jos 2²⁰, Ju 6¹⁴, 1 K 10⁸, 2 K 1² and 8^{8f}, where חָלִי, as in Jer 10¹⁹, has arisen by contraction from חָלִיִּי, or we should simply read חָלִי (in all these passages with וְהָ); Gn 24⁸ (with וְזֹאת); Ex 10¹, 1 K 22²³, Jer 31²¹ (with אֵלֶּה).

The article is sometimes omitted also with the attributes referring to proper names,¹ as צִידוֹן רֶבֶּה Jos 11⁸, 19²⁸, חֲמַת רֶבֶּה Am 6². Other examples are Jos 16^{8,5}, 18¹³, 1 K 9¹⁷ (but in 1 Ch 7²⁴, 2 Ch 8⁵ with the article). In Gn 7¹¹, &c., תְּהוֹם רֶבֶּה is also a case of this kind, תְּהוֹם being used (almost always without the article) as a sort of proper name; cf. also אֵל עֲלִיוֹן the most high

¹ Cf. Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur semit. Sprachwiss.*, p. 48, n. 1.

God and אֱלֹהִים חַי the living God. In Ju 1¹⁵ נָלַת עָלֶיךָ and גַּ' תַּהֲרִית are strange; Jos 15¹⁹ has גַּ' עָלֶיךָ and גַּ' תַּהֲרִית.

≈ Of the remaining examples Is 11⁹ explains itself; the direct connexion of the attribute with its substantive is broken by the insertion of לִי. In Ez 34¹², Hag. 1⁴ (as Wellhausen says, a good instance of a Hebrew adjective in the stative form = סְפִינִים), ψ 143¹⁰, Ct 6¹² (?) the substantive is also (see above) determined by a suffix, and consequently the attribute is less closely attached; the same applies to Gn 37², 42¹⁹, 43¹⁴, ψ 18¹⁸, except that in these passages the omission of the article before ר, א, ע may at the same time be due to considerations of euphony (as also in Jos 16¹ before ע, Nu 14³⁷ before ר, 28⁴, Ez 10⁹ before א, 21¹⁹ before ח).¹ In 1 S 13^{17f.} (אֶחָד) and 2 K 25¹⁶ (שְׁנַיִם) after a determinate substantive), the attribute again, being a numeral, is determinate in itself (see above, x); in Is 65² the א prevents the use of the article; finally, in 2 Ch 26¹⁶ בְּהֻצִים and בְּאַבְנִים are to be read, as in Jer 22¹ הַיָּפֶן for הָיָפֶן, in 22²⁶ אֶרֶץ for הָאֶרֶץ; in 2 S 6³ omit חֲרָשָׁה, and in Ez 39²⁷ omit רְבִיִּם. Without any apparent reason the article is omitted in Dn 8¹³ and 11³¹.

aa 2. When, as in Mi 7¹² (יּוֹם הוּא) in that day?, the article is omitted from both substantive and demonstrative, and in Ezr 3¹², the demonstrative even precedes (הַפִּיִּת הִזָּה = הַזֶּה הַפִּיִּת), this is obviously due in both cases to a radical corruption of the text (not only in the words quoted). In Jos 9¹² לַחֲמִנֵנוּ is either in apposition to the independent demonstrative הַזֶּה (= this our bread, &c.), as in verse 13 נֹאדֹת is to אֵלֶּה, or they are complete sentences, this is our bread, &c. So also in Ex 32¹ מֹשֶׁה (= that [iste] Moses, &c.), and in ψ 48¹⁵ אֱלֹהִים are to be taken in apposition to הַזֶּה. On ψ 68⁸ and Is 23¹³ cf. § 136 d.

§ 127. The Noun determined by a following Determinate Genitive.

Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 475.

a When a genitive, determined in any way, follows a *nomen regens*, it also determines the *nomen regens*, which, according to § 89 a, is always in the construct state. Moreover, every pronominal suffix attached to a substantive is, according to § 33 c, to be considered as a genitive determinate by nature. An independent genitive may be determinate—

(a) By its character as a *proper name* (according to § 125 a), e. g. הַדָּבָר יְהוָה the word of the Lord.

(b) By having the article, e. g. אִישׁ הַמִּלְחָמָה (prop. the man of the war) the soldier (but אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה Jos 17¹, a soldier); אֲנִשֵּׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה

¹ The same reason no doubt also favoured the omission of the article before הוּא and אֵלֶּה, see above, under y. Also in Is 23⁷ (is this your joyous...?) the article is omitted before עֲלֶיךָ probably only for euphony.

Nu 31⁴⁹, *the soldiers*; דְּבַר הַנָּבִיא *the word of the prophet*, Jer 28⁹ (but e. g., on the other hand, מִצְוַת אֲנָשִׁים מִלִּפְדָּה *a commandment of men which hath been taught*, Is 29¹³; דְּבַר-שֶׁקֶר *word of falsehood*, Pr 29¹²).

(c) By the addition of a pronominal suffix (see above), e. g. בֵּית-אָבִי *my father's house*.

(d) By construction with another genitive determined in some way, e. g. Gn 3² עֵץ-הַגֶּן מִפְּרִי *of the fruit of the trees of the garden*. Thus in Is 10¹² four, and in 21¹⁷ even five, members of a series are determined by a concluding determinate genitive.

Rem. 1. The above explains also the various meanings of כָּל (prop. a substantive in the sense of *aggregate, whole*), according as it is followed by a determinate or indeterminate genitive. In the former case כָּל has the meaning of *the entirety*, i. e. *all, the whole* (like the French *tous les hommes, toute la ville*), e. g. כָּל-הָאָרֶץ *the whole* (prop. *the entirety of the*) *earth*, כָּל-הָאָדָם *all men*;¹ Ex 18²², Nu 15¹³, Jer 4²⁹, and cases like Nu 4^{23,47}, 21⁸ where כָּל is followed by a singular participle with the article. On the other hand, before an indeterminate genitive כָּל is used in the more indefinite (individualizing) sense of *of all kinds, any* (cf. *tout homme, à tout prix*), or distributively *each, every*, e. g. כָּל-עֵץ *every* (kind of) *tree*, Gn 2⁹; cf. 4²², 24¹⁰, 1 Ch 29²; כָּל-דָּבָר *any thing*, Ju 19¹⁹; כָּל-יּוֹם *every day, every time*, ψ 7¹².

It is, however, to be observed—

(a) That the article may in this case also (see § 126 h) be omitted in poetic style, although the substantive is to be regarded as determinate, e. g. כָּל-שְׁלֹחָנוֹת *all* (the) *tables*, Is 28⁸.

(b) That the meaning *every* is frequent even before singulars used collectively; afterwards the idea of *quisque* passes naturally into that of *totality*, e. g. כָּל-חַי *each living thing*, i. e. *every* (not *every kind of*) *living thing*; כָּל-בָּשָׂר *all flesh*, i. e. *all men or all living creatures* (with the article only in Gn 7¹⁵ before a relative clause, and in Is 40⁶); sometimes also כָּל-עֵץ *all trees*, כָּל-עוֹף *all birds*; finally—

(c) That before the names of members of the human body, כָּל frequently (as being determinate in itself) denotes the *entirety*, e. g. Is 1⁵ *the whole head, the whole heart* (the sense required by the context, not *every head, &c.*, which the expression *in itself* might also mean); 9¹¹, 2 K 23³, Ez 29⁷ *all* (i. e. *the whole of*) *their shoulders . . . all* (the whole of) *their loins*; 36⁵.—On כָּל with a suffix when it follows a noun in apposition (e. g. Is 9⁸ הָעָם כָּלֹּם *the people, all of it*, i. e. *the whole nation*, more emphatic than כָּל-הָעָם, cf. Driver on 2 S 2⁹), as well as when it follows absolutely in the genitive (= *all men, every one*, e. g. Gn 16¹²),² see the Lexicon, pp. 481^b, 482^b.

2. Gentile names (or patronymics), derived from compound proper names (consisting of a nomen regens and genitive), are determined by inserting the article before the second part of the compound (since it contains the original

¹ הָאָדָם being a collective, cf. כָּל-הָאִישׁ 2 S 15², *all men*, כָּל-הַבָּנִים Ex 1²² *all sons*, כָּל-הַבָּת *all daughters*; in itself כָּל-הָאָדָם could also mean *the whole man*.

² In Ezr 10¹⁷ instead of אֲנָשִׁים בְּכָל read simply בְּכָל-הָאֲנָשִׁים.

genitive), e.g. בְּנֵי־יְמִינִי (see § 86 h) *a Benjamite*; בְּנֵי־הַיְמִינִי Ju 3¹⁵, &c., *the Benjamite*; בֵּית־הַלְחָמִי *the Bethlehemite*, 1 S 16¹, &c. (cf., however, 1 Ch 27¹² עֶרֶם לִבְנֵי יְמִינִי); בֵּית־הַשְּׁמִיטִי *the Beth-shemite*, 1 S 6¹⁴; אֲבֵי־הָעֵזְרִי *the Abiezrite*, Ju 6¹¹, &c., cf. 1 K 16³⁴.

e 3. In a few instances the nomen regens appears to be used indefinitely notwithstanding a following determinate genitive; it is not so, however, in Gn 16⁷, where the reference is to a well-known fountain; 21²⁸, where in the original context there must have been some reason for the *seven ewe lambs of the flock*; 2 S 12³⁰ *the spoil found in the city*; but it often is so before a proper name, as in Ex 10⁹ יְהוָה חַג יְהוָה *a feast of the Lord* (unless it is the spring festival), Dt 7²⁵, and frequently הַנִּזְבָּח יְהוָה *an abomination unto the Lord*; cf. also Gn 46³⁴, Dt 22¹⁹ *a virgin of Israel*; 1 S 4¹² *a man of Benjamin*; Pr 25¹, Ct 2¹, 3⁹; similarly before appellatives with the article (or before a genitive determined by a suffix, as in Lv 14³⁴), 1 S 20²⁰ *three arrows*; 2 S 23¹¹ חֲלֶמֶת הָעֵדָה *a plot of the ground* (but see Gn 33¹⁹, Jos 24³²); Ju 13⁶, Jer 13⁴, 41¹⁶, Ct 11^{13 f}, 5¹³, 7³, 8². On the other hand, שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת in the titles of Psalms 120 to 134 (except 121¹, שִׁיר לַמַּעֲלוֹת) was most probably originally the title of a collection, in the sense of 'the pilgrimage-songs' (according to § 124 r), and was subsequently added to these Psalms severally.—In Ex 20²⁴ בְּכָל־הַמָּקוֹם *in all the place*, sc. of the sanctuary, is a dogmatic correction of בְּכָל־מָקוֹם, *in every place*, to avoid the difficulty that several holy-places are here authorized, instead of the one central sanctuary. In Gn 20¹³ also כָּל־הַמָּקוֹם (unless it means *in the whole place*) is remarkable, since elsewhere *every place* is always (8 times) כָּל־מָקוֹם.

f 4. The deviations mentioned under e, from a fundamental rule of syntax, are in some cases open to suspicion on textual grounds, but much more doubtful are the instances in which the article is found before a noun already determined in some other way, as—

(a) Before a noun which appears to be determined by a following independent determinate genitive. The least questionable are the instances in which the genitive is a *proper name*, since these may be elliptical forms of expression like the apparent construction of proper names with a genitive, noticed in § 125 h, e.g. Nu 21¹⁴ הַנַּחֲלִים אֶרְנוֹן *the valleys, namely the valleys of Arnon*; 2 K 23¹⁷ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בֵּית־אֵל *the altar, namely the altar of Bethel* (i.e. with the suppression of the real nomen regens, מִזְבֵּחַ without the article; by the pointing הַמִּזְבֵּחַ the Masora evidently intends to allow the choice either of reading הַמִּזְבֵּחַ or correcting it to מִזְבֵּחַ); הָאֵל בֵּית־אֵל *the God of Beth-el*¹ (equivalent to הָאֵל אֵל ב'), Gn 31¹³ (the LXX read בַּמָּקוֹם הָאֵל הַנִּרְאָה אֵלֶיךָ בַּמָּקוֹם) *the God who appeared to thee in the holy place*; הַמֶּלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר *the king of Assyria*, Is 36¹⁶ (probably a scribal error due to verse 13; it does not occur in the parallel passage, 2 K 18³¹), cf. Jos 13⁵, 2 K 25¹¹, Jer 38⁶, Ez 47¹⁵; in the vocative, Jer 48³², La 2¹³. On the other hand, שָׂרָה אִמִּי Gn 24⁶⁷ is no doubt

¹ According to Philippi (*St. Constr.*, p. 38) בֵּית־אֵל is rather a case of 'subposition' in the accusative, as also הַדֶּרֶךְ חֲתָלוֹן Ez 47¹⁵ (for which, however, in 48¹ there is the correct reading הַדֶּרֶךְ חֲתָלוֹן) *by the way to Helthlon*; and in fact, Ez 47¹⁵ may without difficulty be explained in this way; so נֶשֶׁן Ex 39²⁷ as an accusative of the material.

only a subsequent insertion; so also יִשְׂרָאֵל Jos 8^{38b} (cf. LXX), 2 S 20²³, 2 K 7¹³, הַמֶּלֶךְ 1 S 26²² after הַחֲנִית (simplified by the Masora to חֲנִית *Q^{ere}*); 2 K 23¹², אֲשֹׁר Is 36⁸ (cf. 2 K 18²³), הַכֶּנֶשׁ Ez 46¹⁹ (unless the article with לִשְׁבוֹת is to be omitted), also הַתְּמִיד Dn 8¹³, and הַנְּבִיא 2 Ch 15⁸. In Ex 9¹⁸ read with the Samaritan לְמִיּוֹם; in 2 S 19²⁵ לָכֵת might possibly be taken in apposition to הַיּוֹם; in 2 K 10¹ restore אֶת־בְּנֵי, with the LXX and Lucian, before אֶהְיֶה; in 2 K 25¹⁹ omit the article, as in Jer 52²⁵, before סָפַר.

A similar ellipse must also be assumed in 2 K 23¹⁷ *the sepulchre is the* ^gsepulchre *of the man of God* (but most probably קֶבֶר has dropped out after הַקֶּבֶר) and ψ 123⁴ (cf., however, the LXX, and observe that in the parallel member the genitive is paraphrased by לֵ).—In Jos 3¹⁴ הַבְּרִית (verse 17 בְּרִית יְהוָה) has been added to the original הָאָרוֹן by a redactor; cf. similar syntactically impossible additions in verse 11 (also in 1 S 4³, &c., where the LXX still had simply יְהוָה); in 2 K 16¹⁴ the Masora evidently combines two different readings הַיָּתֵד and יָתֵד הָאֶרֶג; and similarly in Jer 25²⁶ (where הָאֶרֶץ was only subsequently introduced into the text), the two readings הַמְּלָכֹת and מְלָכֹת הָאֶרֶץ are combined.—In Jos 8¹¹, 1 K 14²⁴, Jer 31⁴⁰, Ez 45¹⁶ the article, being usual after בָּל־, has been mechanically added, and so also in 2 Ch 8¹⁶ after עָר־; in 2 K 9⁴ the second הַנֶּעַר (instead of נָעַר) is occasioned by the first; in Ez 7⁷ מְהִימָה belongs as a nominative to what follows; in Ez 8²⁹ the meaning perhaps is *in the chambers, in the house of the Lord*, or the article is to be omitted; in 1 Ch 15²⁷ the text is manifestly corrupt.

Of another kind are the instances in which a determinate noun is followed ^hby a definition of the material *in apposition* (hence, not in the genitive; cf. § 131), e.g. Zc 4¹⁰ הָאֵבֶן הַבְּדִיל *the weight, the lead, i.e. the leaden weight*; Ex 39¹⁷, 2 K 16¹⁴ הַנְּחָשֶׁת, both here and in verse 17, is probably only a later addition, while הַמַּסְגְּרוֹת הַמַּכְנוֹת in verse 17 has arisen from a confusion of two readings, מַסְגְּרוֹת הַמַּכְנוֹת and מַסְגְּרוֹת מִהַמַּכְנוֹת. In Jer 32¹² also הַמִּקְנֶה (unless the article is simply to be omitted) is in apposition to הַסֶּפֶר.

(b) Before a noun with a suffix (which likewise represents a determinate ⁱgenitive; see above, at the beginning of this section). This does not apply to cases in which a *verbal* (i.e. *accusative*) suffix is affixed to a participle which has the article, e.g. הַמִּכְהֶוֹ Is 9¹², *the one smiting him*; in Dt 8¹⁵, 13⁶ also הֵן is a verbal suffix, but hardly the הֵן in הָעֵשׂוֹ for הָעֵשָׂו Job 40¹⁹, nor the הֵן in הַיְלִדֶּה Dn 11⁶; § 116g. For הָעֶרְבֶּה Lev 27²³, read עֶרְבֶּה as in verses 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, &c., twelve times (but cf. also the note on § 128d).—Of the remaining examples בְּבִבְרָתָה Is 24² (probably an intentional alliteration with the eleven other words beginning with בֶּ), לְמַעַנְהוּ Pr 16⁴, and בְּעֵינָיו (so Baer, following the best authorities) Ezr 10¹⁴, rest only on the authority of the Masoretes, not of the authors. So also הָאֵהָלִי Jos 7²¹, הַחֲצִי Jos 8³⁸ (previously הָחֲצִי), הַהֲרֹתִיָּה 2 K 15¹⁶ (dittography of the ה), the article is simply to be omitted as syntactically impossible; the ו of הַדְּבָרִי Mi 2¹² is the copula belonging to the next word.

§ 128. *The Indication of the Genitive Relation by means of the Construct State.*

Cf. especially Philippi's work cited at the head of § 89.

a 1. The genitive relation is regularly expressed (see § 89) by the close connexion of the *nomen regens* (in the construct state) with the *nomen rectum* (in the genitive). Since only *one* *nomen regens* can be immediately connected with a *nomen rectum*, it follows that the same genitive cannot depend on two or more *co-ordinate* nouns, but a second (sometimes even a third, &c.) *regens* must be added with a suffix referring to the *nomen rectum*, e. g. בְּנֵי דָוִד וּבָנֹתָיו *the sons of David and his daughters* (not בְּנֵי וּבָנֹת דָּוִד); cf. 1 K 8²⁸.¹ The language even prefers to avoid a series of several *co-ordinate*² genitives depending upon one and the same *nomen regens* (such as occur in Gn 14¹⁹, Nu 20⁵, 31⁵⁴ [1 Ch 13¹], 1 S 23⁷, 2 S 19⁶, Is 22⁵, ψ 5⁷, 8³),³ and rather tends to repeat the *nomen regens*, e. g. אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם Gn 24³ *the God of heaven and the God of the earth* (so in Jer 8¹ the *regens* is five times repeated). A lengthened series of genitives may, however, be formed by a *nomen rectum* serving at the same time as *regens* to a genitive depending on it (cf. § 127 *a* [*d*]); e. g. Gn 47⁹ יְמֵי שְׁנֵי חַיֵּי אֲבֹתִי *the days of the years of the life of my fathers*; cf. Jb 12²⁴, where there are three genitives, Is 10¹² four, and 21¹⁷ five (unless the last three are in apposition). As a rule, indeed, such an inconvenient accumulation of genitives is avoided by means of a circumlocution in the case of one of them (see § 129 *d*).

b Rem. As the fundamental rules stated above are the necessary consequence not merely of *logical* but more especially of *rhythmical* relations (see § 89 *a*), we must feel the more hesitation in admitting examples in which genitives are supposed to be loosely attached to forms other than the construct state. Some of these examples (the supposed genitives following a *regens* which is determined by the article) have been already discussed in § 127 *f-h*. Compare, moreover :

c (*a*) Genitives after the absolute state, e. g. Is 28¹ בְּנֵי אֲשֶׁמֶן הַלְוִיָּהּ *the fat valley of them that are overcome with wine*. The usual explanation that בְּנֵי אֲשֶׁמֶן forms one single idea (in German *Fettigkeitstal*), on which the

¹ Very rare, and only possible in very rapid utterance, are such exceptions as Ez 31¹⁶ (מְבַחַר וְטוֹב-לִבְנוֹן); Pr 16¹¹.—In Is 11² *the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord*, רֵעֶת may at any rate also be taken as an absolute genitive, so also כֶּפֶר Dn 1⁴.

² In ψ 114¹ a second genitive is added even without the copula, but the parallelism of the members renders any misunderstanding impossible.

³ In almost all these instances the two (or three) genitives form one closely connected whole, as *heaven and earth, sons and daughters*.

genitive הַלְלוּמִי then depends, in reality explains nothing; the text is almost certainly corrupt. In Dt 15¹⁸ מִשְׁנֵה would be expected; in Jos 3¹¹ הַפְּרִית is a later addition; in Is 32¹³ (מִשְׁוֹשׁ), and ψ 68²² (שְׁעָר), the absolute for the construct state probably rests only on the authority of the Masoretes. In Ju 6²⁵ π. the text is obviously in confusion. In Ju 8³² (cf. 6²⁴) בְּעֶפְרָה should come either after וַיִּקְבֹּר or at the end of the verse, unless, with Moore, we omit אֲבִי הָעֵץ as a gloss (from 6²⁴); in Is 63¹¹ מִשְׁה is probably a gloss on וּמִי־עוֹלָם which has crept into the text; in 2 S 4² לְאִישׁ־בָּשֶׁת, according to the LXX, has dropped out before בֶּן; in Ez 6¹¹ רְעוֹת is to be omitted with the LXX; if originally in the text, it could only be genitive (= *all abominations of evils*), not an adjective; Pr 21⁶ the text is altogether uncertain (the LXX read מִקְשֵׁי for מִבְּרִקְשֵׁי); in 1 Ch 9¹³ the preposition לְ (after a ל) has dropped out before מְלֹאכֶת (cf. 12²⁵).—Elsewhere (Dt 3⁵, 1 K 4¹³, 2 Ch 8⁵) the supposed genitives are to be taken rather as words of nearer definition standing in apposition, i. e. *with high walls, gates, and bars*. In Jer 8⁵ יְרוּשָׁלַם is either in apposition to הָעָם הַזֶּה or is better (since not in the LXX) omitted as a gloss.

(b) Genitives after a noun with a suffix (where the suffix prevents the direct government by the *nomen regens*). Thus in Lv 27^{2,3,5}, where הַזֶּכֶּךְ after עֶרְכֶּךָ^d might be taken, contrary to the accents, as subject of the following clause; in Lv 5^{15,25} the suffix may refer to Moses. In Lv 6³ בְּרִי מְדוּ *his garment*, namely the garment of linen, unless simply in apposition, cf. § 131 d (or read מְדוּ ?); Lv 26⁴², where בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב וְגו' could at most be explained as an ellipse for בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב, cf. § 125 h (probably, however, it is a case of dittography of the י, which was repeated also before אַבְרָהָם; so Valeton, *ZAW.* xii. 3); equally strange is הַיּוֹם בְּרִיתִי הַיּוֹם Jer 33²⁰, &c. On the other hand, אִם יִהְיֶה נְבִיאֲכֶם יְהוָה Nu 12⁶ could not possibly mean *if your prophet be a prophet of the Lord*; the text is manifestly corrupt (probably נְבִיאֲכֶם מִיְהוָה is to be read, with Marti). In ψ 45⁷ בִּסְאֵךְ אֱלֹהִים (usually explained as *thy divine throne*), אֱלֹהִים is most probably a later addition [another suggestion is to read בְּאֱלֹהִים *like God's throne*: cf. § 141 d, note]. In Jer 52²⁰ two readings are probably combined, לְנִחְשָׁתָם without any addition, and לְנִחְשָׁת פֶּל־הַפְּלִים. In Nu 25¹² שָׁלוֹם is in apposition to בְּרִיתִי. On הַרְבֵּה זָמָה Ez 16²⁷, cf. § 131 r.

(c) The interposition of a word is assumed between פֶּל־ (*the whole*; cf. § 127 b) and the genitive governed by it in 2 S 1⁹, Jb 27³ (עוֹד), and, if the text is correct, in Hos 14³ (תִּצָּן). In reality, however, in all three places the genitive relation is destroyed by the transposition of the words (instead of פֶּל־ עוֹד, &c.), and פֶּל־ is rather to be taken adverbially (equivalent to *wholly*), e. g. 2 S 1⁹ *because my life is yet wholly in me*, i. e. *my whole life*; cf. Philippi, *Stat. Constr.*, p. 10.—On the instances in which the original construct state אֵין *non-existence* is used without a following genitive, see the negative sentences, § 152 o.

2. The dependence of the *nomen rectum* on the *nomen regens* by *f* no means represents merely what is, properly speaking, the genitive relation (see the examples under *g-i*). Very frequently the *nomen*

¹ Halévy, *J. A.* xiv. 548, removes the difficulty by pointing עֶרְכֶּךָ.

rectum only adds a nearer definition of the nomen regens, whether by giving the name, the genus or species, the measure, the material, or finally an attribute of it (*genit. epexegeticus* or *appositionis*,¹ see the examples under *k-q*).

Examples. The *nomen rectum* represents—

- g** (a) A *subjective genitive*, specifying the possessor, author, &c., e. g. בֵּית־הַמֶּלֶךְ the king's house; דְּבַר יְהוָה the word of the Lord.
- h** (b) An *objective genitive*, e. g. Ob¹⁰ מִחַמֶּס אָחִיךָ for the violence done to thy brother² (but in Ez 12¹⁹ מִחַמֶּס is followed by a subjective genitive); Pr 20² מִלֵּךְ אֵימַת מֶלֶךְ the terror of a king; Gn 18²⁰ זַעַקַת סֹדִם the cry concerning Sodom; Is 23⁵ צֶרֶם שִׁמְעָה the report of (about) Tyre, cf. 2 S 4⁴; Am 8¹⁰ אֲבֵל יָחִיד the mourning for an only son; Dt 20¹⁴ שָׁלַל אֵיבֶיךָ praeda hostibus tuis erepta; cf. Is 3¹⁴. In a wider sense this includes such examples as עֵץ הַחַיִּים the way of (i. e. to) the tree of life, Gn 3²⁴; cf. Pr 7²⁷, Jb 38²⁰; הַיָּם הַיָּרֵךְ the way of (by) the sea, Is 8²³; וּבְחַיֵּי אֱלֹהִים the sacrifices of (i. e. pleasing to) God, ψ 51¹⁹; שְׁבַעַת יְהוָה the oath of (i. e. sworn before) the Lord, 1 K 2⁴³; דְּבָרֵי לְמוֹאָל the words of (i. e. addressed to) L., Pr 31¹.
- i** (c) A *partitive genitive*; this includes especially the cases in which an adjective in the construct state is followed by a general term, e. g. חַכְמוֹת שְׂרוּתֶיהָ the wisest of her ladies, Ju 5²⁹; cf. for this way of expressing the superlative, § 133 *h*, and also *r* below.
- k** Merely formal genitives (*genit. explicativus* or *epexegeticus*, *genit. appositionis*) are those added to the construct state as nearer definitions—
- (d) Of the name, e. g. נָהָר פָּרַת the river Euphrates; אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן the land of Canaan; בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל the virgin Israel (not of Israel), Am 5².
- l** (e) Of the genus, e. g. Pr 15²⁰ (21²⁰) בֶּסֶלִיל אָדָם a fool of a man (= a foolish man); cf. Gn 16¹², Is 1⁴, 29¹⁹, Ho 13², Mi 5⁴, &c.
- m** (f) Of the species, e. g. אֶחָדָה קֶבֶר a possession of a burying-place, i. e. hereditary sepulchre, Gn 23⁴, &c.; תְּאֵנֵי הַבְּבֵרוֹת the early figs, Jer 24²; אֹהֶל בֵּיתִי the tabernacle of my house, i. e. my dwelling-place, ψ 132³.
- n** (g) Of the measure, weight, extent, number, e. g. מִתֵּי מִסְפָּר people of number, i. e. few in number, Gn 34³⁰, Dt 26⁵; cf. also Ez 47³⁻⁵ waters of the ankles, waters of the loins, waters of swimming, i. e. which reached up to the ankles, or loins, or necessitated swimming; but in verse 4 in apposition (?) מַיִם בְּרַפְּאִים.
- o** (h) Of the material³ of which something consists, e. g. כֶּלִי חֶרֶשׁ a vessel of earthenware, Nu 5¹⁷; כֶּסֶף בְּלִי vessels of silver (cf. the French *des vases d'or*); עֵץ אֲרוֹן an ark of wood, שֵׁבֶט בְּרוֹן a rod of iron, ψ-2⁹; cf. Gn 3²¹, 6¹⁴, Ju 7¹³, &c.

¹ The latter term is preferred especially by König, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1898, p. 528 ff.

² Cf. in Latin a similar use of the genitive after *iniuria* (Caes. B. G. I, 30), *melus* (*hostium*, *Pompeii*, &c.), *spes*, and other words. In Greek, cf. *εὐνοία τῶν φίλων*, *πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ*, *ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ*, 1 Cor. 1¹⁸.

³ In the almost entire absence of corresponding adjectives (אֲרוֹן made of cedar, a denominative from אָרוֹן, and נְהוֹשׁ brazen are the only examples), the language regularly has recourse to the above periphrasis. On the form *qātūl*, as expressing an inherent property, cf. § 50 *f*; cf. also the proper name, בְּרוֹןִי *ferreus*.

(i) Of the attribute of a person or thing, e.g. Gn 17⁸ **אֵהָיָה עוֹלָם** *an everlasting possession*; Pr 17⁸ *a precious stone*; cf. Nu 28⁶, Is 13⁸, 28⁴, ψ 23², 31⁸, Pr 5¹⁹, 14⁵, Jb 41¹⁹, and the examples of the genitive with a suffix given in § 135 n. Such a periphrasis for the expression of attributes frequently occurs, even when the corresponding adjectives are in use. Thus especially **קָדוֹשׁ** *holiness* very frequently serves as a periphrasis for the adjective **קָדוֹשׁ** (e.g. **בְּגָדֵי הַקָּדוֹשׁ** *the holy garments*, Ex 29²⁹), since **קָדוֹשׁ** is used almost exclusively in reference to persons (hence also with **עַם** and **גּוֹי** *people*, and with **שֵׁם** the name of a person); the only exceptions are **מְקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ** *holy place*, Ex 29³¹, &c.; **מַיִם קְדוֹשִׁים** *holy water*, Nu 5¹⁷; **קָדוֹשׁ** as the predicate of **יוֹם** *day*, Neh 8¹⁰^f, and of **מַחֲנֶה** *camp*, Dt 23¹⁵. So also the use of **צַדִּיק** *righteous* is always confined to persons, except in Dt 4⁸; elsewhere the periphrasis with **צַדִּיקָה** or **צִדְקָה** is always used, e.g. **מֵאֲנֵי צִדְקָה** *just balances*, Lv 19³⁶.

In a wider sense this use of the genitive also includes statements of the purpose for which something is intended, e.g. **צֹאן מִבְּחָרָה** *sheep for the slaughter*, ψ 44²³; **מוֹסָר שְׁלֵמָנִי** *the chastisement designed for our peace*, Is 53⁵; cf. 51¹⁷ (*the cup which causes staggering*), ψ 116¹³; finally, also, the description of the material, with which something is laden or filled, e.g. 1 S 16²⁰ **חֲמֹר לֶחֶם וְנָאֵר יַיִן** *an ass laden with bread and a bottle of wine* (but probably **עֲשָׂרָה** is to be read for **חֲמֹר**); cf. Gn 21¹⁴, Pr 7²⁰, &c.

Rem. 1. Certain substantives are used to convey an attributive idea in the construct state before a partitive genitive; thus **מִבְּחָר** *choice, selection*, as in Gn 23⁶ **מִבְּחָר קְבָרֵינוּ** *the choice of our sepulchres*, i.e. our choicest sepulchres; Ex 15⁴, Is 22⁷, 37²⁴; other examples are, Is 1¹⁶ *the evil of your doings*, emphatically, for *your evil doings*; Is 17⁴, 37²⁴ (= *the tall cedars thereof*), ψ 139²², Jb 15²⁶.—This is the more common construction with the substantive **כָּל** *entirely*, for *all, the whole, every*, see § 127 b; it is also frequent with **מְעַט** *a little*, for *few*, 1 S 17²³, &c.

2. To the periphrases expressing attributive ideas (see p above) by means of a genitive construction may be added the very numerous combinations of the construct states **אִישׁ** *a man*, **בָּעַל** *master, possessor*, **בֶּן** *son*, and their feminines and plurals (including **מְתֵי** *men*, used only in the plural), with some appellative noun, in order to represent a person (poetically even a thing) as possessing some object or quality, or being in some condition. In English, such combinations are sometimes rendered by single substantives, sometimes by circumlocution.

Examples:—

(a) Of **אִישׁ**, &c.: **אִישׁ דְּבָרִים** *an eloquent man*, Ex 4¹⁰ (but **שִׁפְתָּיִם** Jb 11² *t a man of lips*, i.e. *a boaster*); **אִישׁ לָשׁוֹן** = *a slanderer*, ψ 140¹²; **אִישׁ דַּעַת** *a man of knowledge*, Pr 24⁵; **אִישׁ חֲמָה** *a wrathful man*, Pr 15¹⁸; **אִישׁ דָּמִים** *a man of blood*, 2 S 16⁷, ψ 5⁷; cf. further, 1 S 16¹⁸, 1 K 2²⁶, Is 53³, Pr 19⁶, 26²¹, 29¹, Ezr 8¹⁸; also **אִשֶּׁת מְרִינִים** *a contentious woman*, Pr 27¹⁵; in the plural, e.g. Gn 6⁴ **אֲנָשֵׁי לִבָּב** *the men of renown, famous*; cf. Gn 47⁶, Is 41¹¹, Jb 34^{8,10} (**אֲנָשֵׁי לִבָּב** *men of understanding*); with **מְתֵי**, e.g. Is 5¹³ **מְתֵי רָעָב** *famished men*; but read probably **מְתֵי רָעָב** *weak with hunger*); ψ 26⁴, Jb 11¹¹, 22¹⁵.

(b) Of **בָּעַל**, &c.: **בָּעַל שֵׁטָר** *hairy*, 2 K 1⁸; **בָּעַל הַחֲלֹמוֹת** *the dreamer*, Gn 37¹⁹; cf. Na 1², Pr 1¹⁷, 18⁹ (*a destroyer*), 22²⁴, 23² (*disposed to eat, greedy*), 24⁸; feminine

בַּעֲלֵח־אוֹב *a woman that hath a soothsaying spirit*, 1 S 28⁷; cf. Na 3⁴; in the plural, e.g. בַּעֲלֵי הַצִּים *archers*, Gn 49²³, בַּעֲלֵי בְרִית *confederates*, Gn 14¹³; בַּעֲלֵי שְׂבוּעָה *sworn supporters*, Neh 6¹⁸.

ו (c) Of בֶּן־חַיִל, &c.: בֶּן־חַיִל *a hero, warrior*, 1 K 15²; בֶּן־מָוֶשֶׁק *heir*, Gn 15²; בֶּן־שָׁנָה *yearling*, Ex 12⁵, &c.; בֶּן־מֵאֵת שָׁנָה *centum annos natus*, Gn 21⁵; בֶּן־מָוֶת *worthy to die*, 1 S 20³¹ (Luther, 2 S 12⁵ *ein Kind des Todes*); cf. Dt 25² בֶּן־הַבֹּת *worthy to be beaten*. Feminine, e.g. בַּת־בַּלְעַל *a wicked woman*, 1 S 16¹⁶; frequently also בַּלְעַל, like the Latin *scelus* for *scelstissimus*, 2 S 23⁶, Jb 34¹⁸. Plural masculine, e.g. בָּנֵי מִרְי *children of rebellion*, Nu 17²⁵. בֶּן־ is used poetically of things without life, e.g. Is 5¹ בֶּן־שֶׁמֶן *a fat*, i.e. a fruitful (hill); Jon 4¹⁰ בֶּן־לַיְלָה *i.e. grown in a night*; Jb 41²⁰ *son of the bow* (i.e. an arrow); so also בָּנֵי רֶשֶׁף = *sparks*, Jb 5⁷; La 3¹³; בָּנוֹת Ec 12⁴ *the daughters of song*, probably meaning the individual notes.

There is another use of בֶּן־ or בָּנֵי to denote membership of a guild or society (or of a tribe, or any definite class). Thus בָּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים or בָּנֵי אֱלֹהִים Gn 6^{2,4}, Jb 1⁶, 21¹, 38⁷ (cf. also בָּנֵי אֱלִים ψ 29¹, 89⁷) properly means not *sons of god(s)*, but beings of the class of אֱלֹהִים or אֱלִים; בְּנֵי־הַנְּבִיאִים 1 K 20³⁵ (singular in Am 7¹⁴) *persons belonging to the guild of prophets*; בְּנֵי־הַרְקָנִחִים Neh 3⁸ *one of the guild of apothecaries*, cf. 3³¹ where בְּנֵי־הַצֹּרְפִים is to be read. Similarly בָּנֵי שְׁלֵשִׁים Gn 50²³ are most probably not *great-grandsons* but *grandsons*, i.e. those belonging to the third generation. Cf. also בָּנֵי הַגֵּרָשֹׁנִי Nu 4^{27 f.} *Gershonites*, בָּנֵי הַקֹּהָתִים 2 Ch 20¹⁹, &c., *Kohathites*; בְּנֵי מִזְרָם *dwellers in the East*.

70 3. Special mention must be made of the not infrequent idiom by which adjectives (sometimes also ordinals, see § 134 o) are added in the genitive, like substantives, rather than as attributes in the same state, gender, and number as the noun which they qualify; thus, Is 28⁴ צִיַּח נָבֵל *the flower of that which fades*, for which verse 1 has צִיַּח נָבֵל *the fading flower*; cf. further, Is 22²⁴, Jer 22¹⁷ (?), 52¹³, ψ 73¹⁰, 74¹⁵ (but אֵיתָן may be a substantive), 78⁴⁹; also the use of רַע as a substantive, e.g. in Pr 21^{14 b}, 6²⁴ (אֲנִישׁ רַע), &c., analogous to the New Testament phrase *ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, Luke 16⁸, and the French *un homme de bien*.¹ Finally, an adverb (treated as a substantive) may likewise be used as an epexegetical genitive; cf. הִנָּהוּ דָּמִי חֲנָם 1 K 2³¹; Pr 24²⁸, 26²; Ez 30¹⁶ (יוֹמָם).

x 3. The epexegetical genitives include finally the numerous nearer definitions which follow the construct state of adjectives (and of active and passive participles, or verbal adjectives, cf. § 116 f-l). For, while the word of nearer definition is added to the verb in the accusative (e.g. חָלָה אֶת־רַגְלָיו *he was diseased in his feet*, 1 K 15²³), it may, with participles and verbal adjectives, be either in the accusative

¹ On the other hand, in such passages as Is 36² (2 K 18¹⁷), Zc 14⁴, Ec 8¹⁰, &c., there is no apparent reason why the Masora requires the construct state instead of the absolute; hence חָיִל Is 36² and יָיָא Zc 14⁴ must be intended as forms of the absolute state, shortened in consequence of their close connexion.

(§ 116 *f* and *k*) or in the genitive, the case of a word depending on a noun. Such a genitive relation is usually termed an *improper annexion*. The nearer definition contains a statement either of the *material*, e.g. Ex 3⁸, &c., זָבַת חֶלֶב וְדָבַשׁ a land flowing with milk and honey; or of the *means*, e.g. חָלַל־הָרֶבֶב slain with the sword, Is 22²; or of the *cause*, Ct 2⁵ sick of love; or of the *scope* of the attribute,¹ e.g. Gn 39⁶ יָפֶה־הָאִר fair of form; cf. Gn 41^{2,4}, Ex 34⁶, Is 1⁴, Jer 32¹⁹, Na 1³, ψ 119¹, Jb 37¹⁶; or of the *manner*, e.g. ψ 59⁶ אִי־בִּגְדֵי אֱמֻנָה faithless ones of wickedness (wickedly faithless).

Especially frequent is the use of this genitive to name the part of *y* the body described as being affected by some physical or mental condition, e.g. ψ 24⁴ נְקִי כַפַּיִם כְּנִי clean as regards hands, &c.; 2 S 9³, Is 6⁵, Jb 17⁹; Is 19¹⁰ אֲנִי־נָפַשׁ גְּרִיבֵית griever in soul; 1 S 1¹⁰, Jb 3²⁰. Also such examples as Am 2¹⁶, Pr 19¹, where a suffix is attached to the substantive, must be regarded as instances of the genitive construction, on the analogy of Pr 14², see § 116 *k*.

§ 129. *Expression of the Genitive by Circumlocution.*

Besides the construction of a nomen rectum dependent upon a nomen *a* regens in the construct state (§§ 89 and 128), the connexion of two nouns may also be effected otherwise, either by simply attaching the dependent noun by means of the preposition לְ, which, according to § 119 *r*, expresses, besides other ideas, also that of *belonging to*,² or by the addition of a relative clause (אֲשֶׁר לְ, see *h* below).

1. The introduction of a genitive by לְ sometimes occurs even when the *b* construction with the construct state would be equally possible, e.g. 1 S 14¹⁶ הַצִּפֹּתִים לְשָׁאוּל the watchmen of Saul; ψ 37¹⁶, 2 Ch 28¹⁸ (where indeed the circumlocution makes the sense much plainer); as a rule, however, this use is restricted to the following cases:—

(a) To prevent a nomen regens being determined by a following determinate *C* genitive, e.g. 1 S 16¹⁸ בֶּן־יִשַׁי a son of Jesse (בֶּן־יִשַׁי would be, according to § 127 *a*, the son of Jesse); cf. Gn 14¹⁸, 36¹², 41¹², Nu 16²² (27¹⁶), 1 S 17⁸, 2 S 19²¹, ψ 122⁵. Hence, regularly מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד (ψ 3¹, &c.) a psalm of David (properly belonging to David as the author), for which לְדָוִד of David is used alone elliptically in ψ 11¹, 14¹, &c. Such a case as מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד (ψ 24¹, &c.) is not to

¹ Cf. the Latin *integer vitae scelerisque purus*; *tristes animi*, &c.

² Cf. the σχῆμα Κολοφώνιον in Greek, e.g. ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ for τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Bernhardy's *Syntax*, p. 88). The Arab grammarians distinguish a twofold genitive, one of which may be resolved by لَ, and the other by مِّنْ [see Wright's *Arabic Grammar*, vol. ii, § 75 ff.]. The *de* of the Romance languages is a development of the latter idea; the Gascon, however, says e.g. *la fille à Mr. N.*, laying stress upon the idea of *belonging to* and not that of *origin*, as in *la fille de . . .* of the literary language.

be regarded as a transposition, but מוֹמור is used epexegetically for the general term omitted before לָדוֹר (as it were, a poem of David, a psalm).

Moreover, the introduction of the author, poet, &c., by this *Lamed auctoris* is the customary idiom also in the other Semitic dialects, especially in Arabic.

- d (b) When a genitive is to be made dependent on a nomen regens, which is itself composed of a nomen regens and rectum, and represents, as a compound, one united idea, e. g. Ru 2³ חֶלֶקֶת הַשָּׂדֶה לְבִעוֹ בְּעוֹ the portion of field belonging to Boaz (בְּעוֹ שָׂדֶה בְּעוֹ) would be the portion of the field of Boaz); 2 K 5⁹ at the house-door of Elisha. This especially applies to the cases in which the compound regens represents a term in very common use, the fixed form of which cannot be altered, e. g. 1 K 14¹⁹ עַל-סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel; 15²³, &c.; cf. also Jos 19⁵¹.

- e (c) When for any other reason the construction with the nomen regens in the construct state is inadmissible; cf. e. g. Lv 18²⁰, where שְׂכִבְתֶּךָ, on account of the suffix, cannot be used in the construct state; but Lv 15¹⁶ אֶפְסָרְךָ, &c., שְׂכִבְתֶּךָ; Ju 3²³ the Jordan fords of Moab (יַרְדֵּן) as a proper name cannot be used in the construct state); Ex 20⁵ upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me; וְעַל-רִבְעִים must be kept in the absolute state for the sake of conformity with עַל-שְׁלֹשִׁים, and for the same reason also לְאַלְפִים לְאַהֲבֵי.

- f (d) After statements of number in such cases as Gn 8¹⁴ בְּשִׁבְעָה וְעֶשְׂרִים יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ on the seven and twentieth day of the month; cf. 7¹¹, 16³ and frequently, or as in Hag 1¹ בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם לְדָרְיוֹשׁ in the second year of Darius; the numeral here is always one compound idea with the substantive numbered, and consequently (as in the examples under b) does not admit of being in the constr. st. with a genitive. The same naturally applies also to such examples as 1 K 3¹⁸ בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לְלִדְתִּי on the third day of my giving birth (i. e. after my giving birth). Cf. also the standing phrase בְּאַחַד לַחֹדֶשׁ on the first (day) of the month, Gn 8⁵ and frequently.

- g Rem. In cases like 2 S 3² and his firstborn was Amnon לְאַחִינֹעַם of Ahinoam, the genitive expressed by circumlocation with לְ is in reality dependent on a regens which is omitted (בֶּן לְאַחִינֹעַם a son of Ahinoam); cf. 2 S 3^{3,5}, 1 K 14¹³, Am 5³ (unless יִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּית originally depended on thus spake the Lord), and the remarks on מוֹמור לָדוֹר under c above.

- h 2. The periphrastic expression of the genitive by means of אֲשֶׁר לְ is used principally to state the possessor, e. g. Gn 29⁹ הֵצֵאן אֲשֶׁר לְאָבִיהָ her father's sheep (prop. the sheep which belonged to her father); Gn 47⁴ and frequently. So also (according to § 128 a) when a genitive depends on more than one substantive, e. g. Gn 40⁵ the butler and the baker who (belonged) to the king of Egypt (וְאִפָּה מֶלֶךְ) would indicate only the baker as belonging to the king); or when a genitive (as in the examples under d above) is added to a compound, which expresses one united idea (Ru 4³); or when, as a fixed term (e. g. a title), it appears always in the same form, e. g. Ct 1¹ שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים אֲשֶׁר לְשִׁלְמוֹה the Song of songs, of Solomon; 1 S 21⁸, 2 S 2⁸, 1 Ch 11¹⁰; cf. also Gn 41⁴³.¹

¹ In New Hebrew שֶׁל (derived from שָׁלַח = אֲשֶׁר לְ, see § 36, and cf. Ct 1⁶, 3⁷ שֶׁלְשִׁלְמוֹה, שֶׁלִּי) is used like the simple relative דִּי, דְּ in Aramaic, as an independent sign of the genitive.

§ 130. Wider Use of the Construct State.

The construct state, which, according to § 89 *a*, primarily represents *a* only the immediate government by one substantive of the following word (or combination of words), is frequently employed in rapid narrative as a connecting form, even apart from the genitive relation; so especially—

(1) Before prepositions,¹ particularly in elevated (prophetic or poetic) style, especially when the *nomen regens* is a participle. Thus before $\text{בְּ, שִׂמְחַת בְּקָצִיר}$ *the joy in the harvest*, Is 9², 2 S 1²¹, ψ 136^{8f}; in participles, Is 5¹¹, 9¹, 19⁸, ψ 84⁷, and especially often when בְּ with a suffix follows the participle, e. g. ψ 2¹² $\text{בְּלִי-חַיִּי בּוֹ}$; cf. Na 1⁷, Jer 8¹⁶ (ψ 24¹); ψ 64⁹ (unless רָאָה should be read); 98⁷.²—Before לְ , Ho 9⁶ (but read probably $\text{בְּכַפְּמֵי מַחְמֵדִי}$); ψ 58⁵ (before לְמֹו); Pr 24⁹, Jb 18², La 2¹⁸ (before לְךָ); 1 Ch 6⁵⁵, 23²⁸; in participles, Ez 38¹¹, Jb 24⁵; before לְ with an infinitive, Is 56¹⁰, and again before לְ with a suffix, Gn 24²¹, Is 30¹⁸, 64³;³—before אֶל- , Is 14¹⁹, Ez 21¹⁷;—before אֶת- (*with*), Is 8⁶;—before כִּן , Gn 3²², Is 28⁹ (a participle); Jer 23²³, Ez 13², Ho 7⁶;—before עַל- , Ju 5¹⁰;—before בְּלִי- , Is 14⁶;—before the *nota accus.* אֵת , Jer 33²²;—before a locative (which in such cases also serves as a genitive), Ex 27¹³, Jer 1¹⁵.

(2) Before *wāw copulative*, e. g. Ez 26¹⁰; but חֲכָמַת Is 33⁶, וַיֵּלֶת 35², בְּ and וַיִּשְׁבֶּרֶת 51²¹ may be cases of an intentional reversion to the old feminine ending *ath*, in order to avoid the hiatus (י) ! הָ—.

(3) When it governs the (originally demonstrative) pronoun אֲשֶׁר ; *c* so especially in the combination אֲשֶׁר מְקוֹם , Gn 39²⁰, 40³, *the place where* (prop. *of that in which*) *Joseph was bound*; cf. § 138 *g*; or אֲשֶׁר בְּמְקוֹם Lv 4^{24,33}, 2 S 15²¹, 1 K 21¹⁹, Jer 22¹², Ez 21³⁵, Ho 2¹. We should expect $\text{אֲשֶׁר הַמְּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר בְּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר}$, as in Gn 35¹³; &c., *at the place which . . .*, cf. § 138; but אֲשֶׁר is treated as a *nomen rectum* instead of as an attribute.

¹ Cf. König, 'Die Ueberwucherung des St.-constr.-Gebrauchs im Semit.,' ZDMG. 53, 521 ff.

² In Ju 8¹¹ the article is even used before ■ construct state followed by בְּ , in order to determine the whole combination $\text{שְׁכֵנֵי בְּאֹהֲלִים}$ *tent-dwellers*, taken as one word; cf., however, the remarks in § 127 *f-i* on similar grammatical solecisms.

³ These are to be distinguished from the cases where לְ follows a construct state, which in conjunction with מִן (and the following לְ) has become a sort of preposition or adverb of place; thus, we have מִבֵּית-לְ Ex 26⁸³ (for which in Ez 1²⁷ merely בֵּית meaning simply *within*; מִיְמִין לְ (2 K 23¹³, Ez 10³) *on the right hand* (i.e. south) of; מִצְפּוֹן לְ (Jos 8^{11,13}, &c., Ju 2⁹) *on the north of*; cf. also Jos 15²¹ and לְפָנֵי מִן Neh 13⁴.

Cf. also מְיוֹם followed by a perfect in 1 S 29⁸, and יָמֵי Lv 13⁴⁶, Nu 9^{18.1}

d (4) When it governs independent sentences (cf. § 155), which virtually stand to the construct state (as *nomen regens*) in a sort of genitive relation, e. g. Ex 4¹³ בְּיַד-הַשֵּׁלַח prop. *by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*; Nu 23³ דְּבַר מֵהִירָאֲנִי the *matter of that which he shall show me*, i. e. whatever he shall; Is 29¹ קִרְיַת הָהָרָה דָּוִד the *city where David encamped*; Jer 48³⁶, ψ 16³ (if the text be right), 65⁵ (Pr 8³²), ψ 81⁶, Jb 18²¹ the *place of him that knoweth not God*; Jb 29¹⁶, La 1¹⁴ (if the text be right) *into the hands of those against whom I cannot stand*.² In Gn 39⁴ (בְּלִישְׁלֹו) the בֶּל־ takes after it a noun-clause, and in Ex 9⁴, still more boldly, a subst. with לְ.—Very often a *time-determination* governs the following sentence in this way; thus אַחֲרֵי followed by a perfect, Lv 25⁴⁸, 1 S 5⁹; ψ 102³ (before a noun-clause), Ex 6²⁸, Nu 3¹, Dt 4¹⁵, 2 S 22¹, ψ 18¹, 59¹⁷, 138⁸ (in every case before a following perfect), ψ 56¹⁰ (before an imperfect); מְיוֹם followed by the perfect, Jer 36²; בְּלִישְׁלֹו Lv 14⁴⁶, 1 S 25¹⁵, Jb 29² (בְּיָמֵי) *as in the days when . . .*³; cf. בְּיָמֹות and שָׁנֹות before a perfect, ψ 90¹⁵; בְּעֵת before a perfect, Jer 6¹⁵ (cf. 49⁸, 50³¹); before an imperfect, Jb 6¹⁷; תְּחִלַּת before a perfect, Ho 1².

e (5) Connected with a following word in apposition; certainly so in such cases as בְּתוּלַת בֵּת-צִיּוֹן the *virgin, the daughter of Zion*, Is 37²²; cf. 23¹², Jer 14¹⁷; also 1 S 28⁷ אִשָּׁת בַּעֲלַת-אֵיב a *woman, possessor of a soothsaying spirit*; cf. Dt 21¹¹.—Gn 14¹⁰, Ju 19²² (but read probably אֲנָשִׁים with Moore, as in Dt 13¹⁴, Ju 20¹³, 1 K 21¹⁰); 2 K 10⁶, 17¹³ Q^{eré}; Jer 46⁹, ψ 35¹⁶ (?), 78⁹, Jb 20^{17b} (unless נִהְיֵי or נִהְיֵי be a gloss).

f Rem. Some of the above passages may also be explained by supposing that there exists a real genitive relation towards the preceding construct state, which has been, as it were, provisionally left *in suspensio*, in consequence of the insertion of some interrupting word, e. g. Is 37²², &c.; Jb 20^{17a}. Elsewhere (Dt 33¹⁹, ψ 68³⁴) the *nomen regens* probably governs the following construct state directly.⁴

¹ In Dt 23⁵ the construct state governs a sentence introduced by the conjunction עַל-דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר by *reason of the fact that*, i. e. *because*; so also in 1 S 3¹³.

² Probably Gn 22¹⁴ is also to be so explained (contrary to the accents), and certainly (contrary to the very unnatural division of the verses) ■ Ch 30¹⁸, which should read on thus: יְהוָה הַטּוֹב יְכַפֵּר בְּעַד כָּל-לִבְבוֹ הַכֵּין the *good Lord pardon every one that setteth his heart to seek God*. [See Wickes' *Accentuation of the Twenty-one Prose Books of the Old Testament*, p. 140.]

³ Cf. Na 2⁹ הִיא מֵיָמֵי, usually explained to mean *from the days that she hath been*, but the text is evidently very corrupt.

⁴ So also Is 28¹⁸ a *corner stone of the preciousness* (יִקְרַת is a substantive not an adjective) of a *fixed foundation*, i. e. a precious corner stone of surest foundation.—In 2 S 20¹⁹ the text is wholly corrupt; in ψ 119¹²⁸ read בְּלִישְׁלֹו.

(6) The numeral אחת *one* for אחת in close connexion, and even with *g* small disjunctives, e. g. Gn 3²², 48²², 1 S 9³, 2 S 17²², Is 27¹², Zc 11⁷.

The character of these passages shows that the numeral here cannot be in the construct state, but is merely a rhythmical shortening of the usual (tone-lengthened) form.

§ 131. *Apposition.*

1. Apposition in the stricter sense is the collocation of two substantives in the same case in order to define more exactly (or to complete) the one by the other, and, as a rule (see, however, below, under *g*), the former by the latter. Apposition in Hebrew (as in the other Semitic languages¹) is by no means confined to those cases in which it is used in English or in the classical languages. It is not infrequently found when either the *subordination* of one substantive to the other or some more circumstantial kind of epexegetical addition would be expected.

2. The principal kinds of apposition in Hebrew are:—

(a) The collocation of *genus* and *species*, e. g. אִשָּׁה אֶלְמָנָה *a woman b* (who was) *a widow*, 1 K 7¹⁴; נַעֲרָה בְּתוּלָה *a damsel* (that is) *a virgin*, Dt 22^{23, 28}, Ju 4⁴, 19¹, 21¹², 1 S 30¹⁷, 1 K 1²; cf. Gn 13⁸, 21²⁰ (where, however, נַעֲרָה is probably an explanatory gloss); Ex 24⁵ (1 S 11¹⁵), 2 S 15¹⁶, 1 K 3¹⁶, 5²⁹ (but probably בְּבֵל should be read instead of בְּבָל); Is 3²⁴ (unless בְּמַעֲשֵׂה is to be read), Jer 20¹. Perhaps also כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ *the priest* (who is) *the chief man*, 2 K 25¹⁸, &c.; others take כֹּהֵן as constr. st.—In 2 S 10⁷ read $\text{כָּל-עֲבָדָא הַגִּבּוֹר}$ with the LXX, as in the parallel passage 1 Ch 19⁹ for $\text{כָּל-עֲבָדָא הַגִּבּוֹר}$, which is evidently meant to refer to the reading in 2 S.

(b) Collocation of the *person* or *thing* and the *attribute*, e. g. Jb 20²⁹ c (27¹³) $\text{זֶה חֵלֶק אָדָם רָשָׁע}$ *this is the portion of a man*, (who is) *a wicked man* (but רָשָׁע might also be an adjunct.); cf. Pr 6¹².—Lv 6¹³, 16⁴ (where, however, לִרְשׁוֹ is probably a gloss); Pr 22²¹ אֱמָתִים אֱמָתִים *words* (which are) *truth*; (immediately after אֱמָתִים cf. 1 S 2¹³, Mi 1¹¹ (where, however, בְּשֵׁת is most probably a gloss on עֲרִירָה); Zc 1¹³ (= *comfortable words*); ψ 45⁵ (?), 68¹⁷ (cf. verse 16). In a wider sense this includes also such cases as ψ 60⁵ $\text{יַיִן תַּרְעִילָהּ}$ *wine* which is *staggering* (intoxicating drink), which causes staggering²; 1 K 22²⁷, 2 Ch 18²⁶ $\text{לִחַץ בָּיִם לִחַץ}$ (in

¹ On certain uses of apposition peculiar to the Semitic languages, cf. the exhaustive discussion by Fleischer, 'Ueber einige Arten der Nominalapposition im Arab.' (*Kleine Schriften*, ii. 16); [and see also Driver, *Tenses*, Appendix IV.]

² Unless it is to be translated *thou gavest us intoxication to drink as wine* (and so in 1 K 22²⁷ *give him affliction to eat as bread*, &c.); cf. ψ 80⁶ and the analogous examples of apposition in the form of a second accusative in § 117 *kk*. More-

Is 30²⁰ parallel with צָרָה (צָרָה) *water* which is *affliction*, drunk in trouble (imprisonment). Still more boldly, 1 K 5³ בָּקָר רָעִי *oxen* which were taken out of the *pastures*, and 1 K 6⁷ *undressed stones* which come from the *quarry*, probably a corruption of מִמַּסֵּעַ. A person and a condition are in apposition in Ez 18⁶ (unless בְּנִדְתָּהּ is to be read).—In 1 S 4¹ read הָעֵבֶר, as in 5¹, 7¹².

- d (c) Collocation of the *person* (Dt 28⁵⁶) or *thing* (form) and *material*,¹ or of the *place* or *measure* and its *contents*, e.g. 1 Ch 15¹⁹ בְּמִצְלָתֵיהֶם with *cymbals* which were *brass*, i.e. of *brass*; cf. Ex 26²⁵, Dn 11⁸, 1 Ch 28^{15,18} (?); Ex 28¹⁷ *four rows*, namely *stones* (for which 39¹⁰ has סֵאֶה טָלָת 1 טוֹרֵי אֲבָן); cf. 2 Ch 4¹³, Lv 6³ (see, however, § 128 d); 2 K 7¹ סֵאֶה טָלָת 1 טוֹרֵי אֲבָן *a seah of fine flour*; cf. 2 K 7^{16,18}, Gn 18⁶, Ex 16³³, Lv 5¹¹, Ru 2¹⁷, 1 K 16²⁴, 2 K 5²³ כֶּסֶף כְּבָרִים *two talents of silver*;² cf. 5¹⁷, Ex 39¹⁷, Ez 22¹³ (if the text be right). With the *material* placed before the *measure*, Ex 30^{23f}.—A *period of time* and its *contents* are placed in apposition אֶחָד חֹדֶשׁ *a month of days*, i.e. a month's time=for a whole month, Gn 29¹⁴, Nu 11^{20,21}, cf. Dt 21¹³, 2 K 15¹³, and שְׁנַיִם יָמִים *two years' time*, i.e. two full years, Gn 41¹, 2 S 13²³, 14²³, Jer 28^{3,11}, Dn 10^{2f}.

Finally, under this head may be included all the cases in which a numeral (regarded as a substantive) is followed by the object numbered in apposition, e.g. בָּנִים שְׁלֹשָׁה *trias* sc. *filii*, § 97 a and § 134 b.

- e (d) Collocation of the *thing* and the *measure* or *extent*, *number*, &c., e.g. Nu 9²⁰ יָמִים מְסָפָר *days*, (a small) *number*, i.e. only a few days; כֶּסֶף מְשֻׁנָּה *money, repetition*, i.e. twice as much money, Gn 43¹² (unless כֶּסֶף be constr. st.); מַיִם בְּרָפִים *water* which was of the measure of the *knees*, which reached to the knees, Ez 47⁴ (also מֵי מִתְּנָיִם *water that was to the loins*, in the same verse). This likewise includes the cases in which a noun is followed in apposition by a numeral (see § 134 c) or an adverb, originally conceived as a substantive, e.g. Neh 2¹² אֲנָשִׁים מְעַט *men, a few*, i.e. some few men; 1 K 5⁹ תְּבוּנָה הַרְבֵּה *understanding, much-making*, i.e. much understanding, unless הַרְבֵּה is to be taken as an adverb with וַיִּתֵּן, as in 2 S 8⁸ with לָקַח.

over, having regard to הַרְבֵּה עֵינִי *spiced wine*, Ct 8², and עֵינִי פָרָא *a wild ass's colt*, Jb 11¹² (in which passages עֵינִי and עֵינִי must certainly be in the construct state) we cannot but ask whether the Masora does not intend the עֵינִי in ψ 60⁵ to be taken as construct state (for which elsewhere (עֵינִי)).

¹ Cf. also the examples treated above in § 127 h.

² On the anomalous form כְּבָרִים (instead of כְּבָרִים; cf. כְּבָרִים immediately before), see § 88 b.

(e) Collocation of the *thing* and its *name*, e.g. בְּהָרֵם שֵׁעִיר *in their f mountainous district, Seir* (perhaps only a later gloss), Gn 14⁶; הָאָרֶץ כְּנָעַן *the land Canaan* (כְּנָעַן probably only a later gloss), Nu 34²; cf. Ezr 9¹, 1 Ch 5⁹ (see under *g* below).—For examples of nouns in the construct state before a noun in apposition, see § 130 e.

Rem. 1. Only in certain combinations does the noun of nearer definition *g* come first, e.g. הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה *king David, king Solomon* (less frequently הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד as in 2 S 13³⁹, 1 K 2¹⁷, 12², 2 K 8²⁹, 9¹⁵, and in late Hebrew, Hag 1^{1.15} [cf. the Aramaic order מַלְכָּא דְרִישׁ], and often in Chron.).—A chiasmus occurs in Is 45⁴, the name standing after the defining noun in the first part of the verse, and before it in the parallel clause.

2. When the *nota accusativi* (אֶת, אֶת־) or a preposition precedes the first *h* substantive, it may be repeated before the noun in apposition, e.g. Gn 4², 22², 24⁴, 47²⁹, Is 66²¹; this usually occurs when the nearer definition precedes a *proper name*. As a rule, however, the repetition does not take place (Dt 18¹, Jer 33¹⁸, 1 S 2¹⁴). A noun in apposition is made determinate, even after a noun with a prefix, in the ordinary way, e.g. 2 Ch 12¹³ בִּירוּשָׁלַם הָעִיר *in Jerusalem, the city which, &c.*¹

3. Sometimes a second adjective is used in apposition to a preceding *i* adjective, in order to modify in some way the meaning of the first, e.g. Lv 13¹⁹ בְּהָרֶת לְבָנָה אֲדָמָדֶמֶת *a white-reddish (light red) bright spot*.

4. *Permutation* is to be regarded as a variety of apposition. It is not complementary like apposition proper (see *a* above), but rather *defines* the preceding substantive (or pronoun, see below), in order to prevent any possible misunderstanding. This includes cases like Gn 9⁴ *with the life thereof* (which is) *the blood thereof*; Ex 22⁵⁰, Dt 2²⁶, 1 S 7⁹, 2 K 3⁴ *an hundred thousand rams, the wool*, i.e. the wool of the rams; Jer 25¹⁵ *this cup of the wine, that is of fury* (but הַחֶמֶה is probably a gloss); Is 42²⁵ *he poured upon him fury, namely his anger*; ² but especially the examples in which such a permutative is added to a preceding pronoun, viz.—

(a) To a separate pronoun, e.g. Ex 7¹¹; with regard to the vocative, cf. l § 126 f.

(b) To an accusative suffix, e.g. Ex 2⁶ *she saw him, the child* (unless אֶת־הִי *m* be a later gloss); Ex 35⁵, Lv 13^{57b}, 1 K 19²¹ (where, indeed, הַבֶּשֶׂר appears to be a late gloss); 21¹³, 2 K 16¹⁵ *Keth.*, Jer 9¹⁴, 31², Ez 3²¹, Ec 2²¹ (according to Delitzsch rather a double accusative).³

(c) To a noun-suffix, e.g. Ez 10³ בָּבֹאוֹ הָאִישׁ *when he went in, the man*; 42¹⁴; *n* cf. Pr 13⁴ (?), Ez 3¹²; so also after a preposition with suffix, e.g. Ec 4¹⁰ הָאֶחָד לֹא הָאֶחָד *woe to him, the one alone*; with a repetition of the preposition, Nu 32³³, Jos 1² לָהֶם לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *to them, to the children of Israel*; Ju 21⁷, Jer 51⁵⁶,

¹ In 1 K 11⁸ participles after לְכָל־נַשְׂיוֹ, as in 2 K 10⁶ after הָעִיר, are used in 19² after a determinate accusative, and in Hag 1⁴ after בְּבִתְיָכֶם, are used without the article; these, however, are probably to be explained not as in apposition, but according to § 118 p.

² But כִּי־מִן Gn 6¹⁷ (cf. 7⁶) is to be regarded as a later gloss upon the archaic מִבּוֹל.

³ For וַיִּשְׁנֶה 1 S 21¹⁴ either וַיִּשְׁנֶה is to be read or the *Kethibh* is to be explained according to § 75 b, note. Also יִלְכְּדֵנוּ Pr 5²² has hardly preserved the correct form.

Ez 42⁵ (?), Dn 11¹¹, 1 Ch 4⁴², 2 Ch 26¹⁴.¹—Cf. finally, Ct 3⁷, where the suffix precedes the genitive periphrastically expressed by שָׁלֵל, as in Ez 9¹, where the genitive is expressed by לֵי.²

O Of a different kind are the cases in which the permutative with its proper suffix follows as a kind of correction of the preceding suffix, e.g. Is 29²³ *when he* (or rather) *his children see*, &c. (but יִלְדָיו is clearly a gloss); cf. ψ 83¹²; in Jb 29³ read בְּהֶחָלוֹ (inf. Hiph.) or at least its syncopated form בְּחָלוֹ.

P 5. Cases of apposition in a *wider* sense are those in which the nearer definition added to the noun was originally regarded as an *adverbial accusative*; on its use with the verb and on the relative correctness of speaking of such an accusative in Hebrew, cf. § 118 a and m. Owing to the lack of case-endings, indeed, it is in many instances only by analogies elsewhere (especially in Arabic) that we can decide whether the case is one of apposition in the narrower or in the wider sense; in other instances this must remain quite uncertain. However, the following are probably cases of apposition in the wider sense:—

Q (a) Such phrases as מִשְׁנֶה כֶּסֶף a double amount in money, Gn 43¹⁵; cf. Jer 17¹⁸; 1 S 17⁵ five thousand shekels in brass, but this might also be taken (as in d) shekels which were brass; certainly such cases as Jb 15¹⁰ older than thy father in days, and the expression of the superlative by means of מְאֹד (originally a substantive), e.g. מְאֹד טוֹב very good, Gn 1³¹ (cf. also Ec 7¹⁶ צַדִּיק הַרְבֵּה righteous over much), and the very frequent מְאֹד הַרְבֵּה prop. a much-making exceedingly, i.e. exceedingly great, Gn 15¹, 41⁴⁹, also Pr 23²⁹ פְּצָעִים חִנָּם wounds without cause,³ perhaps also Gn 34²⁶ (פֶּטַח).

R (b) A few examples, in which an exegetical substantive is added to a substantive with a suffix; thus, Ez 16²⁷ מְדַרְבֵּנָה וְזָמָה of thy conduct in lewdness (but it is also possible to explain it (as in c) of thy conduct, which is lewdness); cf. Ez 24¹³, 1 S 22³³ חֵיל מְעוֹנִי my fortress in strength, i.e. my strong fortress (cf., however, ψ 18³³); Hb 3⁸, ψ 71⁷. While even in these examples the deviation from the ordinary usage of the language (cf. § 135 n) is strange, it is much more so in חֹב חֲבָלָתוֹ Ez 18⁷, i.e. according to the context his pledge for a debt; Ezr 2⁶² בְּתִבְתָּם הַמִּתִּי־חֲשִׁים, i.e. their register, namely of those that were reckoned by genealogy (but perhaps הַמִּתִּי is in apposition to the suffix in בְּתִבְתָּם), also the curious combinations (mentioned in § 128 d) of בְּרִיתִי with a proper name (Lv 26⁴²), and in Jer 33²⁰ with הַיּוֹם.⁴

¹ But in Is 17⁶ we should certainly divide the words differently and read אֲחֶרֶת הַשְּׂמֻחָה in Jer 48⁴⁴ read אֵלֶּה for אֵלֶּיהָ, and in Pr 14¹³ אֲחֶרֶת הַשְּׂמֻחָה; in Gn 2¹⁹ נָפֶשׁ חַיָּה is a late gloss upon לוֹ, and in Ez 41²⁵ אֲלִידֹלֶתוֹת הַהֵיבֶל ■ gloss on אֵלֶיהֶן.

² Some of the examples given above are textually (or exegetically) doubtful, whilst in the case of others, especially those from the later Books, we cannot help asking whether such a prolepsis of the genitive by means of a suffix (as e.g. Ez 10³) is not due to the influence of Aramaic, in which it is the customary idiom; cf. Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aram.*, § 81 e and § 88.

³ In ψ 69⁵ חֲנָם (like נֶקֶר in a false way, falsely, ψ 35¹⁹ and 38²⁰) is used as an *adverbial accusative* with a participle; cf. § 118 q.

⁴ But in Nu 25¹² שְׁלוֹם may also be explained, according to c, as really in apposition. Cf. on the whole question Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 4th ed., p. 203, note 1.

6. In Dt 33⁴ מוֹרֶשֶׁה (מֹרֶשֶׁה), perhaps לְקַהֲלָת מוֹרֶשֶׁה is to be read), 33²⁷ (מִעֲנֶה), Ju 7⁸ s (צָרָה), the absolute state appears to be used instead of the construct to govern a following logical genitive; this, however, cannot be explained either as a special kind of apposition, or (with Hitzig) as a peculiarity of the dialect of Northern Palestine, but is merely a textual corruption. On the other hand, in Jb 31¹¹ עֵץ פְּלִילִים is evidently intended to combine the readings עֵץ פְּלִילִים and עֵץ פְּלִילִי (as in verse 28).—The remarkable combination אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת in ψ 80^{8,15} is due to the fact that in ψ 42–83 אֱלֹהִים has almost throughout been subsequently substituted by some redactor for the divine name יְהוָה; on אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת cf. § 125 h. In ψ 59⁶, 80^{5,20}, and 84⁹ יְהוָה has been reinstated in the text before אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת.¹

7. Lastly, the nearer definition (qualification) of a noun may be effected by *t* means of a preposition (either with a suffix or with an independent noun), but must then be distinguished from the cases in which the preposition is dependent on a verb or verbal idea, e. g. Gn 3⁶ and she gave also לְאִישָׁה עִמָּה unto her husband with her (= her husband who was with her); in Gn 9¹⁶ (that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh) and other places, the qualification of the noun is itself also qualified.

§ 132. Connexion of the Substantive with the Adjective.²

1. The adjective (like the participle used adjectivally), which serves *a* as an attribute of a substantive, stands *after* the substantive, and agrees with it in *gender* and *number*, e. g. אִישׁ גָּדוֹל *a great man*, אִשָּׁה יָפָה *a beautiful woman*. If the substantive is immediately connected with a genitive, the attribute follows the latter, since, according to § 89 and § 128 *a*, the construct state and the genitive belonging to it are inseparably united, e. g. Est 8¹⁵ עֲטָרַת זָהָב גְּדוֹלָה *a great crown of gold*.—On the attribute when attached to a *determinate* substantive, see above, § 126 *u*.

¹ Without this assumption it would be inconceivable that אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת should not have been written; that the author of these Psalms regarded צְבָאוֹת already as an independent name of God (so Gesenius and Olshausen) is out of the question.

² On the expression of attributive ideas by substantives, cf. above, § 127 *h*, and § 128 *o*, with the note; § 135 *n* and § 141 *c* (substantives for adjectives as predicates of noun-clauses) and § 152 *u* (periphrases for negative qualities). On the use of the feminine of adjectives (and participles) to express abstract ideas, see § 122 *q*. It remains to mention further the employment (mostly only in poetry) of certain epithets in place of the substantives to which the quality in question belongs; e. g. אֶבְיִר *the strong one*, i. e. God; אֶבְיִר *the strong one*, i. e. the bull (in Jer 8¹⁶, &c., the horse); קָלִי *swift* = the runner (of the horse, Is 30¹⁶); לְבָנָה *alba*, i. e. luna; פְּרִיָּה (fructifera) *a fruitful tree*, Is 17⁶ (so פֶּרֶת Gn 49²²); רֹמֵץ *a croucher*, i. e. a crouching beast of prey, Gn 4⁷. Cf. also רֶגֶז (gravis, augustus) and נָשִׂיא (elatus?), i. e. a prince. The use of adjectives and participles for substantives is much more extensive in Arabic. In Greek and Latin poetical language cf. such examples as ὑγρή = the sea; merum for vinum, &c.

b Rem. 1. Where an adjectival attribute appears to stand before its substantive (according to the usual explanation, for the sake of special emphasis) the relation is really appositional in character; thus, Is 10³⁰ עֲנִיָּה עֲנִיתוֹת *O thou poor one, Anathoth!* (but probably עֲנִיָּה answer her, is to be read); cf. 23¹², 53¹¹ (a righteous man, my servant; but in 28²¹ זָר and נֶכְרִי are predicates preceding the substantives); Jer 36^{10 f.}, ψ 18⁴ him who is worthy to be praised will I call upon, the Lord; 92¹² (apposition after participles).—But רַבִּים and רַבּוֹת many, are sometimes placed, like numerals, before the substantive, Jer 16¹⁶, Neh 9²⁸ (in ψ 145⁷ רַב is = *subst. regens*, in 89⁵¹ the text is corrupt); an appositional relation can scarcely be intended in these instances.

c 2. In a few expressions (mostly poetic) the adjective appears not as an attribute after the substantive, but in the construct state governing it; so in the singular, Ex 15¹⁶ (unless נֶזֶל should be read); 1 S 16⁷ (the height of his stature); in the plural, 1 S 17⁴⁰ חֲלָקֵי אֲבָנִים smooth ones of (among) stones, i.e. smooth stones; Is 35⁹, Ez 7²⁴, ψ 46⁵, and with a following collective instead of a plural, e.g. Is 29¹⁹ אֲבִיוֹנֵי אָדָם the poor among men, i.e. poor men; Jer 49²⁰, Zc 11⁷; cf. in Latin *canum degeneres*. However, in almost all these cases the adjective which is made into a *regens* is strongly emphatic, and is frequently equivalent to a superlative (see below, § 133 g).

d 3. When two adjectives follow a feminine, sometimes only that standing next to the noun takes the feminine termination, e.g. 1 K 19¹¹ רֵיחַ גְּדִלָּהּ וְחֶזֶק וְגוֹי (but read גְּדִלָּהּ); 1 S 15⁹ (but cf. § 75 y); Jer 20⁹, ψ 63². A similar dislike of the feminine form may also be observed in the case of verbal predicates referring to feminine subjects, cf. § 145 p and t.

When an attribute qualifies several substantives of different genders, it agrees with the masculine, as being the *prior gender* (cf. § 146 d), e.g. Neh 9¹³ מִכֵּימָר וּמִצֹּת טוֹבִים; Jer 34⁹, Zc 8⁵.

When three attributes follow a substantive, the first two may stand without a conjunction, and the last be attached by *wāw copulative*, cf. Zc 1⁸.

e 4. After feminines plural ending in ים (§ 87 p) the adjectival attribute (in accordance with the fundamental rule stated above, under a) takes the ending וֹת, e.g. Is 10¹⁴ בְּיָצִים עֲזוּבוֹת forsaken eggs; Gn 32¹⁶. For a strange exception see Jer 29¹⁷ (differently in 24²).

f 5. With regard to number it is to be remarked that—

(a) Substantives in the dual are followed by adjectives (or participles) in the plural, e.g. ψ 18²⁸ (Pr 6¹⁷) עֵינַיִם רָמוֹת haughty eyes; Is 35³, Jb 4^{3 f.}, cf. § 88 a.

g (b) Collective ideas are not infrequently joined with the plural of the adjective or participle (*constructio ad sensum*); thus, e.g. צֹאן sheep [with fem. plur.], Gn 30⁴³, 1 S 25¹⁸; עָם = men, 1 S 13¹⁵, Is 9¹; כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל = all the Israelites, 1 S 2¹⁴; גְּלוֹת = the exiles, Jer 28⁴; cf. also נַפְשֵׁי שְׁנַיִם two souls, Gn 46^{27.1}. Cf. similar phenomena in the connexion of collectives with plural predicates in § 145 c.

h (c) The *pluralis excellentiae* or *pluralis maiestatis* is joined, as a rule, to the singular of the attribute, e.g. ψ 7¹⁰ אֱלֹהִים צָדִיק 2 K 19^{4.16} (= Is 37^{4.17}); Is 19⁴; but cf. אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים 2 Dt 5²³, 1 S 17^{26.36}, Jer 10¹⁰, 23³⁸, perhaps also

¹ But it is impossible to take תְּמִימִים in Ez 46⁶ as an attribute of בָּקָר; probably it is a correction intended to harmonize the passage with Nu 28¹¹, where two young bullocks are required.

² Cf. 1 S 28¹³, where אֱלֹהִים (in the sense of a spirit) is followed by עֲלִים as a second accusative; conversely in 1 S 19^{13.16}, a singular suffix refers back

Ex 20³ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים = *another god*, and Jos 24¹⁹ אֱלֹהִים קְדָשִׁים (but cf. above, § 124 g-k). On the other hand, 1 S 4⁸ is to be explained as having been said by the Philistines, who supposed that the Israelites had several gods. On the connexion of אֱלֹהִים with a plural predicate, see § 145 i.

2. On the adjective (in the construct state) governing a following genitive, see § 128 x; for the participle in the same construction, see § 116 f-l.

§ 133. *The Comparison of Adjectives. (Periphrastic Expression of the Comparative and Superlative.)*

A. Wünsche, 'Der Komparativ im Hebr. im Lichte der arab. Gramm.,' in *Vierteljahrsschrift für Bibelkunde*, 1904, p. 398 ff.

1. Hebrew possesses no special forms either for the comparative or *a* superlative of the adjective.¹ In order to express a comparative, the person or thing which is to be represented as excelled in some particular quality is attached to the attributive word by the preposition מִן (מִי), e. g. 1 S 9² גָּבוֹהַּ מִכָּל-הָעָם *higher than any of the people*. The fundamental idea evidently is, *tall away from all the people* (beyond all the people); cf. Ju 14¹⁸ מֶה-מֶתוֹק טַרְבִּיּוֹשׁ וְמָה עוֹ מֶמַּרִי *what is sweeter than honey? and what is stronger than a lion?* Ez 28³, Am 6². Frequently an infinitive appears as the object of the comparison, e. g. Gn 29¹⁹ *it is better that I give her to thee, than that I should give her*, &c.; Ex 14¹², ψ 118^{8f. 2}.

Rem. 1. This use of מִן is also very common when the attributive idea is *b* represented by an intransitive verb, e. g. 1 S 10²³ וַיִּגְבֹּהַּ מִכָּל-הָעָם *and he was higher than any of the people*; Na 3⁸, Jb 7⁶. Elsewhere, especially after transitive verbs, מִן rather represents (on its different senses see § 119 v-z) the idea

to תַּרְפִּים *household god* (but not so in Gn 31³⁴), as in ψ 46⁴ to the plural of amplification יַמִּים *sea*. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether רַבָּה ψ 78¹⁵ is to be regarded as an attribute of תַּהֲמוֹת and not rather as the adverb, *abundantly*.

¹ There is in Arabic a special form of the adjective (the *elative*) for the comparative and superlative, which in Hebrew would have the form אֶקְטֵל. Instances of it, perhaps, are אֶכָּזֵר *daring, cruel*, אֶכְזֹב *deceptive* (of a brook drying up), and its opposite אֵיתָן (contracted from 'aitan) *constantly flowing, perennis*. These forms are, however, used without any perceptible emphasis, and cannot be regarded as more than isolated relics of an elative formation which has become obsolete, much as the Latin comparative disappears in Italian, and still more so in French, and is supplanted by the circumlocution with *più, plus*.

² In Ju 11²⁵ the adjective is specially intensified by repetition, *art thou so much better than Balak?* It would also be possible, however, to translate *art thou really better . . . ?*

of a separation, distinction or superiority of one person or thing from or over others.¹ This is evident in such cases as בָּחַר מִן to choose something (to prefer it) before something else, e.g. Jb 7¹⁵, cf. Dt 14² (also יִתְרוֹ . . . מִן the excellence of . . . over . . ., Ec 2¹³); it is also seen in examples like Gn 37⁸ וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל אָהַב אֶת-יוֹסֵף מִכָּל-בְּנָיו now Israel loved Joseph more than all his (other) children; 29³⁰, 1 S 2²⁹, Ho 6⁶.²

- C 2. A somewhat different idea underlies the use of מִן after adjectives, or intransitive verbs possessing an attributive sense, when the thought to be expressed is that the quality is too little or too much in force for the attainment of a particular aim or object, e.g. Is 7¹³ הַמְעַט מִכֶּם is it a small thing (i.e. too little) for you to . . . ? Jb 15¹¹; after an intransitive verb, e.g. Gn 32¹¹ I am too insignificant (קָטָנִיתִי) for all the mercies (I am not worthy of . . .), &c.; cf. also the expressions כָּבֵד מִן to be too heavy for one, Ex 18¹⁸, Nu 11¹⁴, ψ 38⁵; קָשָׁה מִן to be too hard for one, Dt 1¹⁷; מְעַט מִן to be too few for something, Ex 12⁴; זָבֵר מִן to be too strong for one, ψ 65⁴; עָצָם מִן to be too mighty for one, Gn 26¹⁶; גָּבֹהַּ מִן to be too high for one, ψ 61³; צָר מִן to be too narrow for one, Is 49¹⁹; קָצֵר מִן to be too short for something, Is 50², and very frequently נִפְלְאָה מִן to be too wonderful for one (and, consequently, inconceivable or unattainable), Gn 18¹⁴, Dt 17⁸, 30¹¹, Jer 37¹⁷, Pr 30¹⁸; in ψ 139⁶ פְּלִאָה in the same sense is followed by מִן.—This use is especially seen in the numerous instances in which the attribute is followed by מִן with an infinitive, e.g. 1 K 8⁶⁴ the brazen altar . . . was קָטָן מִהֵבִיל too little to receive (to be able to receive) the burnt offering, cf. Gn 4¹³, 36⁷ too great for them to dwell together; after verbs, e.g. Ex 12⁴, Is 28²⁰, ψ 40⁶. Finally, cf. רַב לָכֶם מִן, followed by the infinitive, it is enough (prop. too much) for you to . . ., meaning ye have . . . long enough, 1 K 12²⁸; cf. Ex 9²⁸ and Ez 44⁶ (מִן followed by a substantive).³

d In all these instances מִן expresses either the removal of a thing from a person, or the severance of the person from some aim or object; cf. also the expression לֹא-יִבָּצֵר מֵהֶם כֵּל וְנוֹי nothing will be unattainable for them (prop. there shall not be cut off from them anything which, &c.), Gn 11⁶, Jb 42³.

- e 3. The attributive idea, on which מִן logically depends, must sometimes, in consequence of a pregnant use of the מִן (see the analogous examples in § 119 f), be supplied from the context, e.g. Is 10¹⁰ וּפְסִלֵיהֶם מִירוּשָׁלַיִם whose graven images were more numerous than those at Jerusalem, &c.;⁴ Mi 7⁴ worse than a thorn hedge; ψ 62¹⁰ lighter than a breath; Jb 11¹⁷ clearer than the noonday; Ec 4¹⁷ better than, &c.

¹ Cf. the Latin ablative with the comparative; also the etymology of such words as *eximius*, *egregius*, and the Homeric *ἐκ πάντων μάλιστα*, Il. 4, 96; *ἐκ πασέων*, 18, 431.

² On the other hand, the phrase צָדַק מִן expresses not a comparison, but only a relation existing between one person and another; thus, in Gn 38²⁶ צָדַקָה מִמֶּנִּי means, she is in the right as against me; cf. ψ 139¹², Jb 4¹⁷, 32².—In Pr 17¹² rather (to meet with so and so) than . . . is expressed by וְאַל before the second member.

³ Cf. also 2 K 4³, where the idea of doing something too little is paraphrased by the Hiph. הַמְעַט = do not too little, sc. לְשָׂאֵל in borrowing empty vessels.

⁴ With this *comparatio decurtata*, cf. the still bolder pregnant construction in ψ 4⁸, מְעַט greater gladness than at the time, &c.

2. The correlative comparatives *greater—less* (*older—younger*) are *f* expressed by the simple adjective with the article (*the great*, equivalent to *the greater*, &c.); Gn 1¹⁶, 19^{31,34}, 27¹⁵, 29^{16,18,26}.

3. To express the *superlative* it is also sufficient (see above, *f*) to *g* make the adjective determinate, either by means of the article or a following partitive genitive (or suffix); in this case the article or genitive indicates that the attribute in question belongs especially to one or more definite individuals; ¹ e.g. 1 S 9²¹ הַצָּעִירָה *the least*; 16¹¹ הַקָּטָן *the little one*, i.e. the *youngest* of eight sons; 17¹⁴ David was הַקָּטָן *the youngest*, and the three great, i.e. elder, &c.; Gn 42¹³, 44², Ct 1⁸.—So also with a qualifying adjective, e.g. Gn 9²⁴ בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן *his youngest son*; cf. Jos 14¹⁵; also with a following genitive, 2 Ch 21¹⁷ קָטָן בְּנֵי הַקָּטָן *the youngest of his sons*: Pr 30²⁴ *the least upon the earth*; with suffix, Mi 7⁴ טוֹבָם *their good one*, i.e. the best of them; Jon 3⁵ מִמְּדוֹלָם *from the greatest of them even to the least of them*; cf. the inverse order in Jer 6¹³, 31³⁴.

Rem. 1. The above examples apply only to the most common *relative h* attributes (*great, small, good*), and to expressions which by usage easily came to be recognized as periphrases for the superlative. Other adjectives, however, when followed by a partitive genitive, also acquire the sense of a superlative; this appears from the context, e.g. Dt 33¹⁹ *the most hidden treasures of the sand*; Ju 5²⁹ *the wisest amongst her ladies*; Is 14³⁰, 19¹¹, 23^{8f.}, 29¹⁹, Jer 49²⁰, Ez 28⁷, Ze 11⁷, ψ 45¹³, Jb 30⁶ (*in the most horrible of valleys*), 41²²; probably also ψ 35¹⁶. On this government by the adjective generally, cf. § 132 c.—Moreover, the combination of a substantive in the construct state with an adjective used substantivally (§ 128 w) sometimes serves as a periphrasis for the superlative, e.g. Is 22²⁴ כָּל בְּלֵי הַקָּטָן *all the smallest vessels*. On Ct 7¹⁰ see § 126 x.

2. Other periphrases for the superlative are the use of a substantive in the *i* construct state before the plural of the same word (which is naturally to be regarded as a partitive genitive; cf. our *book of books*), e.g. Ex 26³³ קֹדֶשׁ הַקֹּדְשִׁים *the most holy place*; שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים (Ct 1¹) *the most excellent song*; cf. Gn 9²⁵ (= *servus servorum*, *the lowest servant*); Nu 3³², Dt 10¹⁷ (ψ 136^{2,3}) ²; 1 K 8²⁷, Is 34¹⁰ (cf. Gal 1⁵, Rev 22⁵); Jer 3¹⁹, Ez 16⁷, 26⁷ (*king of kings*, of Nebuchadrezzar; cf. 1 Tim 6¹⁵, Rev 17¹⁴, 19¹⁶, and another kind of periphrasis in ψ 95³); Ec 1¹². Similarly in Jer 6²⁸ two participles are combined, and in Ho 10¹⁵ two substantives in the singular. Finally, the same object is attained by connecting one substantive in the construct state with another of the same stem (שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹ *a sabbath of solemn rest*, i.e. an obligatory day of rest, Ex 31¹⁵, &c.) or of the same meaning (e.g. חֹשֶׁךְ אַפְּלָה *a thick darkness*, Ex 10²²).

3. The intensification of attributes by means of repetition belongs rather *k* to rhetoric than to syntax, e.g. Ec 7²⁴ עֲמֹק עֲמֹק *exceeding deep*; 1 S 2³, Pr 20¹⁴; the adjective is even used three times in Is 6³.—Cf. the repetition of adverbs for the same purpose in Gn 7¹⁹, Nu 14⁷ מְאֹד מְאֹד *exceedingly*, also מְאֹד מְאֹד Ex 1⁷, &c.); Ez 42¹⁵.—On the other hand, in Dt 28⁴³ the repetition expresses

¹ Cf. also עֲלִיּוֹן *the one above*, i.e. *the Most High*.

² *God of gods, and Lord of lords*, just as the supreme god of the Babylonians is called *bēl bēli* (Tiele, *Compend. der Rel.-Gesch.*, p. 87).

a continuous progress, *higher and higher . . . lower and lower*; in Dt 2²⁷ (see § 123 e) and 16²⁰ (*nothing but justice*) the constancy of the action. Cf. Ex 23³⁰ מְעַט מְעַט *little by little, very gradually*.¹

- l The repetition of substantives serves also as a periphrasis for the superlative in such cases as לָרֹרֶר (Ex 3¹⁵) = *to the remotest generations*; cf. 17¹⁶, Jer 6¹⁴, 8¹¹ (*perfect peace*); Ez 21³² עָנָה three times);² 35⁷, Na 1²; cf. also Ho 2^{21 f.} and the emphatic combination of synonymous verbs in Is 33¹⁰. Sometimes the completeness of an action or state is expressed by placing together two or even three substantives of the same stem and of similar sound, cf. Is 22⁵, Ez 6¹⁴ (33^{28 f.}, 35⁸); 32¹⁵, Na 2¹¹, Zp 1¹⁵ (Jb 30⁸, 38²⁷).

§ 134. Syntax of the Numerals.

Cf. the exhaustive statistics collected by Sven Herner, *Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.*, Lund, 1893. E. König, 'Zur Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.,' *AJSL*. xviii. 129 ff.

- a 1. The numerals from 2 to 10, as being originally abstract substantives,³ may be connected with their substantives in three different ways. They may stand either —
- (a) In the construct state *before* the substantive (the object numbered being consequently in the genitive), e.g. שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים *a triad of days*, i. e. three days; שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים *the two men*; or
- b (b) In the absolute state *before* it (the object numbered being in apposition, § 131 d), e.g. בָּנִים שְׁלֹשָׁה *a triad*, viz. sons, i. e. three sons; שְׁנֵים אָנָשִׁים *two men*; or
- c (c) In the absolute state (likewise in apposition) *after* the object numbered, e.g. בָּנוּת שְׁלוֹשׁ. So especially in long lists, since in these the substantives naturally come first, e.g. Gn 32¹⁵, Nu 7¹⁷, 28¹⁹. Apart from such cases, the frequency of this order in the later Books is due to the fact that the character of the numeral tended more and more to become adjectival rather than substantival.⁴

¹ Adverbs of the same stem are connected in this way in Nu 6⁹, Is 29⁵, 30¹³; of different stems in Is 5²⁶ and Jo 4⁴. In Nu 12² the particles אֵף רַק appear to be placed together for a similar purpose, equivalent to *simply and solely*.

² Different in kind from the triple utterance of the same words in 2 S 18³³, Jer 7⁴ and 22²⁹, and the double exclamation in Jer 4¹⁹ and La 1¹⁶ (?).

³ Cf. § 97 a, where it is shown that the masculine is the original form of the numerals (used for both genders), and that the feminine was afterwards differentiated and used with masc. nouns, primarily in the second decade and then in the first as well.

⁴ From Herner's tables (op. cit., pp. 55-66) it appears, according to p. 68, that in the documents J, E, D of the Pentateuch, and in Jos 1-12, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Minor Prophets, Psalms, Megilloth, and Job, the numeral never, or very rarely, stands *after* its noun; in Kings and Ezekiel it stands several times *after*; in the Priestly Code nearly always *after*; in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, nearly as often *after* as *before* the noun. In Ex 28¹⁰ the Masora makes the numeral in the genitive follow the construct state of the substantive numbered; we should, however, read וְאֶת-שְׁמוֹת הַשָּׁשֶׁה; for the omission of the article before וְ, cf. § 126 w.

Rem. In Lv 24²² אָהָר follows the construct state מְשַׁפֵּט, but here as in *d* Nu 15¹⁶ מְשַׁפֵּט should be read. In Gn 42¹⁹ אָהָר is in apposition to a substantive with a suffix (= *one of you brethren*; but verse 33 *the one of you brethren*). In Nu 31²⁸ אָהָר precedes the substantive in the Aramaic manner (= *one each*).—For מֵאָה־שָׁנָה (Gn 17¹⁷, &c.) we find regularly in the Priestly Code (except in Gn 17¹⁷, 23¹) מֵאָת שָׁנָה (Gn 5³, &c.) *an hundred years*. On the connexion of abstract numerals with suffixes, as שְׁנֵיהֶם *their duality*, i. e. *they two*, Gn 2²⁵, &c., (also with a strengthening separate pronoun, as שְׁנֵינוּ אֲנִיחֵנוּ 1 S 20⁴²), cf. § 97 *i*.

2. The numerals from 2 to 10 take the object numbered in the *e* plural,¹ with very few exceptions, such as Ex 16²² (where שְׁנֵי הָעֶמֶר = *the double of an omer*), 2 K 22¹, Ez 45¹, cf. 2 K 8¹⁷ and 25¹⁷ *Keith*. The numerals from 11 to 19 generally take the plural, but with certain substantives frequently used with numerals the singular is more common (see further, under *f*). The tens (from 20 to 90), when they precede, take the singular (in the accusative, cf. § 131 *p*) of certain nouns frequently used with numerals (אֶלֶף *a thousand*, אִישׁ, יום, כֶּרֶם, נֶפֶשׁ, שָׁקֶל—but only in Ezekiel and the Priestly Code), otherwise the plural, as בָּנִים, בָּנוֹת, עָרִים (but cf. also Ju 11⁵³), &c.; on the other hand, the plural is necessary when they follow the object numbered in apposition (e. g. אַמּוֹת עֶשְׂרִים *twenty cubits*, 2 Ch 3^{3f}; with the exception of 2 S 24²⁴, only in late Books). After מֵאָה and אֶלֶף the substantive numbered may be used either in the singular or plural, see further under *g*.

Rem. 1. After the numerals from 11 to 19 the singular is used, as a rule, *f* with יום *day*, שָׁנָה *year*, אִישׁ *man*, נֶפֶשׁ *soul* (person), שִׁבְטָא *tribe*, מִצְבֵּה *pillar* (Ex 24⁴), sometimes with אַמָּה *cubit*, חֹדֶשׁ *month*, עִיר *city*, שָׁקֶל *shekel* (compare our *four-year-old*, *ten pound*), e. g. Dt 1² אֶחָד עָשָׂר יוֹם (cf., however, such exceptions as Dt 1²³, Jos 4², &c.).—Substantives other than these are used in the plural with the numerals from 11 to 19, and the numeral may even follow the substantive, especially in later passages, as Nu 7^{87f}, 1 Ch 4²⁷, 25⁵.

2. After מֵאָה (מֵאָת) [so almost exclusively in the Priestly Code, e. g. always *g* אֶלֶף], (מֵאָת אֶלֶף, מֵאָתִים, מֵאָתִים אֶלֶף) and אֶלֶף (אֶלְפִים, אֶלְפִים, אֶלְפִים) the substantives אִישׁ, אַמָּה, אֶלֶף, יום, רֶגֶל, צֶמֶד are regularly used in the singular, generally also שָׁנָה, כֶּרֶם, נֶפֶשׁ (with the exception of Jos 7²¹, 2 S 14²⁶, &c.); cf., moreover, Gn 33¹⁹, 24⁶⁰ (אֶלְפֵי רֶבְכָּה), Est 1¹, Ju 21¹², Dt 7⁹, 1 K 5¹², 2 Ch 9¹⁵.—Examples of the *plural* after מֵאָה are Gn 26¹², 1 S 18²⁵, 2 S 16¹, 1 K 18⁴; after מֵאָת Ex 38²⁷; after מֵאָתִים Ju 15⁴, 2 S 8⁴, 1 K 10¹⁷,

¹ On examples such as Gn 46²⁷ נֶפֶשׁ שְׁנֵיהֶם *two souls*), cf. § 132 *g* (collectives joined with the plural of the adjective).

Ez 42¹⁷; after מֵאָהִים I S 25¹⁸, I K 7²⁰; after אֶלֶף I S 25², I K 3⁴, 5⁶, 2 K 3⁴, ψ 90⁴; after אֲלָפִים I S 17⁵, Jb 42¹²; after אֶלֶף Mi 6⁷; after אֲלָפִים Is 36⁸.—In Dn 12¹¹ the plural יָמִים precedes the numeral *twelve hundred*.

h 3. Numerals compounded of tens and units (like 21, 62) take the object numbered either *after* them in the singular (in the accusative), e. g. Gn 5²⁰ שְׁנָה וְשִׁשִּׁים שָׁנִים *two and sixty years* (שְׁנָה in the singular, according to *e*, since it conforms to the ten immediately preceding; but also שְׁנָה וְשִׁמְנָה שָׁנִים Dt 2¹⁴), or *before* them in the plural, especially in the later Books, Dn 9²⁶, &c.; or the object is repeated (but only in I K 6¹, and the Priestly Code; sometimes even several times, e. g. Gn 23¹, 25^{7.17} thrice) in the plural with the units, and in the singular with the tens and hundreds, e. g. Gn 12⁴ חֲמִשׁ שָׁנִים וְשִׁבְעִים שְׁנָה *seventy and five years*; Gn 23¹ מֵאָה שְׁנָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנִים וְשִׁבְעָה שָׁנִים *an hundred and twenty and seven years*. Cf. Gn 5^{6 ff.}

i Rem. 1. It may further be remarked with regard to the order, that the thousand or thousands always precede the hundreds, &c., and the hundreds almost always come before the smaller numbers (in Kings and Ezekiel sometimes, and in the Priestly Code usually, after the smaller numbers), the tens in the earlier Books (documents J and D of the Pentateuch, in Joshua 1–12, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, and also in Ezra and Nehemiah) *before* the units, but in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Priestly Code, Joshua 13–24 *after* the units (see Herner, op. cit., p. 73). After the hundreds the smaller number is very frequently added without ׀, especially in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel.

On the syntax of the cardinals in general:—

k 2. The cardinals are determined by the article, when they refer back without being connected with the object numbered; cf., however, Lv 25^{10 f.}, Nu 16³⁵, Jos 4⁴, 2 S 23¹³) to a number or list already mentioned, e. g. Gn 2¹¹ שֵׁם הָאֶחָד פִּישׁוֹן *the name of the one (the first) is Pishon*; Gn 14⁹ אַרְבָּע מְלָכִים *four kings against the five* (enumerated in verse 2); cf. I Ch 11^{20 f.}, and the determinate tens in Gn 18^{29.31 f.} A demonstrative with the article may also be added to a numeral determined in this way, e. g. Dt 19⁹ (but cf. also Gn 6¹⁹, 22²³, where the numeral and demonstrative are practically determinate in themselves). In the case of the numerals from 11 to 19 the article may stand either before the unit (I Ch 25¹⁹, 27¹⁵) or before עֶשֶׂר (Jos 4⁴); it is used before all three members of a compound number (273) in Nu 3⁴⁶.

l In apposition with any determinate substantive the cardinal number is used *without* the article, not only when it precedes the substantive, as in Jos 15¹⁴ אֶת־שְׁלוֹשָׁה בְנֵי הָעֵקֶן, where שְׁלוֹשָׁה is equivalent to a substantive determinate in itself; cf. Gn 18²⁸, Jos 6^{8.22}, I S 17¹⁴, I K 11³¹, and the passages discussed above in § 126 *x*, Gn 21²⁹, &c.), but also when it follows the substantive, e. g. I K 7^{27.43 f.} עֶשֶׂר and עֶשְׂרֶה; the omission of the article may here, as in the cases noticed in § 126 *z*, be also due to the dislike of a hiatus, but cf. also שְׁנָיִם 2 K 25¹⁶ after a determinate substantive. The fact that it is by nature determinate would also be a very simple explanation of אֶחָד Nu 28⁴, I S 13^{17 f.}, Jer 24², Ez 10⁹, instead of the more usual הָאֶחָד, and of אֶחָת I S 1² for הָאֶחָת.

3. Certain specifications of *measure, weight, or time*, are commonly omitted ⁷⁰ after numerals, e.g. Gn 20¹⁶ אֶלְפָּיִם כֶּסֶף *a thousand (shekels) of silver*; so also before וְהָב Gn 24²², 1 K 10¹⁶, Is 7²³, cf. ψ 119⁷². Moreover, Ru 3¹⁵ שֵׁשׁ עֶזְרִים *six (ephahs) of barley*; 1 S 10⁴ שְׁתֵּי-לָחֶם *two (sc. loaves, see verse 3) of bread*, cf. 17¹⁷ עֶשְׂרֵה לָחֶם; 2 S 16¹, where before מֶרֶץ *a measure, or perhaps some term like cakes*, is to be supplied.—The number of cubits is stated in the Priestly Code (Ex 26², &c.) and in 1 K 6 and 7 (otherwise only in Ez 40^{5, 21}, 47³, Zc 5², 1 Ch 11²³, 2 Ch 4^{2 f.}) by the addition of בְּאַמָּה prop. *by the cubit*. Also in Ex 27¹¹ the Samaritan and LXX read אַמָּה after אֹרֶךְ, and in 27¹⁵ אַמָּה after עֹשֶׂה.

Rem. In numbering days of the month and years, the cardinals are very frequently used instead of the ordinals even for the numbers from 1 to 10, e.g. בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם 1 K 15²⁵; בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ 2 K 18¹, &c., cf. Dt 15⁹. The months themselves are always numbered by the ordinals (בְּרֵאשִׁי, &c., up to בְּאַחֲרֵי), but not the days of the month, e.g. בְּאַחֲרֵי לַחֹדֶשׁ Gn 8⁵, &c., בְּתִשְׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ Zc 7¹; בְּחִמְשָׁה לַחֹדֶשׁ Ez 1¹, &c., בְּשִׁבְעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ 2 K 25⁸, בְּתִשְׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ Lv 23³² (always, however, בְּעֶשֶׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ on the tenth day of the month). On the

F f 2

omission of יום in all these cases see under *n*; only in late passages is יום added, e. g. 2 Ch 29¹⁷ בַּיּוֹם שְׁמוֹנֶה לַחֹדֶשׁ; Ezr 3⁶ מִיּוֹם אֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ.—Finally, when the year is stated by בִּשְׁנַת governing a determinate ordinal, viz. 2 K 17⁶ בִּשְׁנַת הַתְּשִׁיעִית *in the ninth year*; 2 K 25¹ (in Jer 52⁴ בִּשְׁנָה), Jer 28¹ *Keth.*, 32¹ *Keth.*, 46², 51⁵⁹, Ezr 7⁸; בִּשְׁנַת in such cases is again (see note 2 on *o*) to be explained according to § 128 *k*. This is supported by the fact that the Masora on Jer 28¹, 32¹ requires in the *Qere* בִּשְׁנָה for בשנת.

q 5. *Distributives* are expressed either by repetition of the cardinal number, e. g. Gn 7^{9,15} שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם *two and two*; 2 S 21²⁰ שֵׁשׁ וְשֵׁשׁ *six each*; with the numbered object also repeated, e. g. Jos 3¹² אִישׁ אֶחָד אִישׁ *for every tribe a man*; Nu 13², 34¹⁸ (אֶחָד מֵן), as in Neh 11¹, *one out of every ten*; cf. § 123 *d*; or a periphrasis with אֶחָד is used, Nu 17¹⁸, Dt 1²³, cf. Is 6² לְאַחַד after *six wings* twice repeated; the simple distributive לְ is, however, sufficient (as in לְבָרִים, § 123 *c*), e. g. לְמֵאוֹת וּלְאַלְפִים *by hundreds and by thousands*.

r 6. The *multiplicatives* are expressed either (like the ordinals above *io*, see under *o*) by the cardinals (in the feminine, probably owing to the omission of פַּעַם, פְּעָמִים; so König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 228), as שְׁתַּיִם *twice*, Jb 40⁵; שִׁבְעָה *seven times*, Lv 26^{21,24}, Pr 24¹⁶; cf. also אַחַת *once*, 2 K 6¹⁰, Jb 40⁵, for which in Jb 33¹⁴ בְּאַחַת along with בְּשְׁתַּיִם (the latter also in 1 S 18²¹); or by the *dual* of the numeral, thus שְׁבַעַתַּיִם Gn 4¹⁵ (in verse 24 along with the cardinal 77 for 77 times); Is 30²⁶, ψ 12⁷, 79¹²; אַרְבַּעַתַּיִם 2 S 12⁶; ² or periphrastically by פַּעַם *a time* (prop. *a step*, with the article, הַפַּעַם *this time*; cf. also הַפַּעַם הַזֶּה, with בָּ, like בְּאַחַת above), as פַּעַם אַחַת *once* (Neh 13²⁰ וּשְׁתַּיִם *once and twice*), שְׁלֹשׁ רַגְלִים *twice*, שְׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים (for which in Ex 23¹⁴, Nu 22^{28,32} *three times*; cf. Ez 41⁶ *thirty-three times*; 2 S 24³ *an hundred times*; Dt 1¹¹ *a thousand times*; 1 K 22¹⁶ עַד-כַּמָּה פְּעָמִים *until how many times*, i. e. *how often*. Cf. also עֶשְׂרֵת מָנִים *ten times*, Gn 31^{7,14}, and רַבּוֹת עֵתִים *many times*, Neh 9²⁸.—In Gn 43³⁴, *five times* is expressed by חֲמִשׁ יָדוֹת (prop. *five hands*), ³ and in Ex 16⁵ the *double* is expressed by מְשַׁנָּה עַל- (prop. *a repetition over and above that which*, &c.).—Of the ordinals שְׁנִית is used as a numeral adverb, Gn 22¹⁵, &c., *a second time*, cf. the Latin *tertium consul*; בְּשָׁלִישִׁת *the third time*, 1 S 3⁸; פַּעַם חֲמִישִׁית *a fifth time*, Neh 6⁵; בְּשִׁבְעִית *at the seventh (time)*, 1 K 18⁴⁴, and פַּעַם הָשִׁי Jos 6¹⁶.

¹ But בְּאַחַת Nu 10⁴ is to be translated *on one* (trumpet).

² Probably also כְּפָלָיִם Jb 11⁶ (from כָּפַל *doubling*) does not mean *doubled* but *manifold*.

³ But אַרְבַּע הַיָּדוֹת Gn 47²⁴ means *the (other) four parts*; cf. 2 K 11⁷, Neh 11¹.

Rem. The collocation of a numeral with the next above it (either in the same or in different sentences) is a rhetorical device employed in *numerical sayings* to express a number, which need not, or cannot, be more exactly specified. It must be gathered from the context whether such formulae are intended to denote only an insignificant number (e.g. Is 17⁶, *two* or at the most *three*), or a considerable number, e.g. Mi 5⁴. Sometimes, however, this juxtaposition serves to express merely an indefinite total, without the collateral idea of intensifying the lower by means of the higher number. Thus *one* and *two* are connected by ו, Dt 32³⁰, Jer 3¹⁴, Jb 33¹⁴, 40⁵ (without ו, ψ 62¹²); *two* and *three*, Is 17⁶ (Sirac 23¹⁶, 26²⁸, 50²⁵), and without ו, 2 K 9³², Ho 6², Am 4⁸; *three* and *four*, Jer 36²³, Am 1³⁻¹¹, Pr 30¹⁸, 21²⁹ (Sirac 26⁵), and without ו, Pr 30¹⁵; *four* and *five*, without ו, Is 17⁶; *six* and *seven*, Jb 5¹⁹, Pr 6¹⁶; *seven* and *eight*, Mi 5⁴, Ec 11²; (*nine* and *ten*, Sirac 25⁷).

III. Syntax of the Pronoun.

§ 135. The Personal Pronoun.

1. The *separate* pronouns,—apart from their employment as the *a* subject in noun-clauses (cf. § 141 a) and the idiom mentioned under *d-h*,—are used, according to § 32 b, as a rule, only to give express emphasis to the subject; e.g. Gn 16⁵, 2 S 24¹⁷ אֲנִי i.e. *I myself*, so also אֲנִי 2 S 12²⁸, 17¹⁵ (after the verb), Ez 34¹⁵, ψ 2⁶;¹ but 1 S 10¹⁸, 2 S 12⁷, Is 45¹² אֲנִי *I* and none else; cf. also אֲנִי אֲנִי *I, I!* Ho 5¹⁴, &c.; אֲתָה Gn 15¹⁵, Ju 15¹⁸, 1 S 17⁵⁶ (as in 20⁸, 22¹⁸, Ex 18¹⁹, Dt 5²⁴, Ju 8²¹, after the imperative); 1 K 21⁷; אֲתָם Gn 9⁷, Ex 20¹⁹ (after the verb, Ju 15¹²); fem. Gn 31⁶; הִיא 1 S 22¹⁸; הִיא Gn 3²⁰, Ju 14³; הִנֵּה Jer 5⁵.— Sometimes, however, the separate pronoun appears to be placed before the verb more on rhythmical grounds, i.e. in order to give the statement a fuller sound than that of the bare verbal form (cf. the similar use of the infinitive absolute, § 113 o). Thus Gn 14²³, ψ 139², and most clearly in such passages as Gn 21²⁴, 47³⁰, Ex 8²⁴, Ju 6¹⁸, 11⁹, 1 S 12²⁰, 2 S 3¹³, 21⁶, 1 K 2¹⁸ (in solemn promises). The same explanation applies to אֲנִי at the beginning of sentences, e.g. Gn 24⁴⁵, Ho 5³, 10¹¹, 12¹¹, ψ 39¹¹, 82⁶, Jb 5³.²

Rem. 1. Different from this is the pleonastic addition of the separate *b* pronoun immediately after the verb (according to Delitzsch on Ct 5⁵ perhaps

¹ Also הוּא, הִיא *he himself, she herself* (of persons and things), e.g. Is 7¹⁴ אֲרִנִי הוּא *the Lord himself*; Est 9¹ הַיְּהוּדִים הֵמָּה *the Jews themselves*. In the sense of *the same* (ὁ αὐτός) or (*one and*) *the same*, הוּא is used in Is 41⁴, 43^{10,13}, 46⁴, 48¹² (always אֲנִי הוּא), ψ 102²⁸ (אֲתָה הוּא), and probably also Jb 3¹⁹.—The position of הֵמָּה, as an accusative of the object, before a perfect in 1 Ch 9²², can at most be explained on the analogy of Aramaic (Ezr 5¹²).

² As early as the Mēša' inscription (line 21 ff.) אֲנִי frequently stands at the beginning of a new sentence after the dividing stroke.

a trace of popular language), e.g. 1 S 23²² (?), Ct 5⁵, and (like other indications of the very late origin of the book) very frequently in Ecclesiastes, e.g. 1¹⁶, 2^{11,15}, 3¹⁷, and thirteen other places; in Aramaic, Dn 5¹⁶.

- c 2. Substantival subjects also are somewhat frequently resumed, and thus expressly emphasized, by the insertion of the corresponding separate pronoun of the 3rd person before the predicate is stated, e.g. Gn 3¹² *the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she* (הִיא) gave me, &c.; 14²⁴ (הֵם); 15⁴, 24⁷, &c.; but הוּא in Is 7¹⁴ after the predicate and subject is equivalent to *he himself*.¹

- d 2. Not infrequently the separate pronoun serves to give strong emphasis to a suffix of the same person which precedes (or sometimes even to one which follows), whether the suffix be attached to a verb (as accusative) or to a noun or preposition (as genitive). In English such an emphasis on the pronoun can generally be rendered only by laying greater stress upon it, or sometimes by repeating it; cf., on the contrary, the French *mon livre à moi*. The separate pronoun in such instances is not to be regarded as a *casus obliquus* (accusative or genitive), but as the subject of an independent sentence, the predicate of which must in each case be supplied according to the context.

- e Examples of emphasis:—

(a) On a verbal suffix by means of אֲנִי (אֲנִי), Gn 27³⁴ בִּרְכֵנִי גַם-אֲנִי *bless me, even me also* (prop. *bless me, I also would be blessed*); Zc 7⁵; cf. also Ez 6³, 34^{11,20} הִנְנִי אֲנִי; by אַתָּה (אַתָּה) Pr 22¹⁹ (but the text is most probably corrupt).—The separate pronoun *precedes* in Gn 24²⁷ (אַנְכִי); 49⁸ אַתָּה, not *Judah, thou art he whom*, but *Judah thee, thee thy brethren shall praise I*, and Ec 2¹⁵ אֲנִי גַם.

- f (b) On a noun-suffix with a substantive, by means of אֲנִי 2 S 19¹, Pr 23¹⁵; by אַתָּה 1 K 21¹⁹ אַתָּה גַם-אֶת-דָּמְךָ *thy blood, even thine*; by הוּא 2 S 17⁵, Jer 27⁷, Mi 7³; by אֲנִיחֵנוּ 1 S 20⁴², after שְׂנֵאֵנוּ, but without special stress; Neh 5² (?); by אֲתָם Nu 14³²; by הֵם ψ 38¹¹ (without special stress), הִמָּה ψ 9⁷.—The separate pronoun *precedes* in Jb 21⁴ (אַנְכִי); Gn 40¹⁶, Is 45¹², 1 Ch 28² (אֲנִי); Zc 9¹¹ (אַתָּה); Jos 23⁹ (אַתָּם); Ez 33¹⁷ (הִמָּה).—In ψ 89⁴⁸, where אֲנִי might be taken as strengthening חָלַל (equivalent in sense to חָלַלְךָ), we should read אֲנִי for אֲנִי, as in verse 51.

- g (c) On a suffix united with a preposition, 1 S 25²⁴ בִּי אֲנִי *upon me, upon me*; 1 K 1²⁶ אֲנִי . . . לִי; 2 Ch 35²¹ אַתָּה לֹא-עָלִיךָ *not against thee*; 1 S 19²³ גַּם עָלַי *upon him also*; Dt 5³ אֲנִיחֵנוּ *but with us, even us*; Hag 1⁴ אֲתָם *for you yourselves*; Jer 25¹⁴ בָּם גַּם-הִמָּה.—The separate pronoun *precedes* in 1 S 12²³ לִי . . . אַנְכִי; 1 K 1²⁰ עָלֶיךָ . . . אַתָּה; Mi 5¹ מִמָּךְ . . . אַתָּה, and 2 Ch 28¹⁰ אֲתָם עִמָּכֶם.

- h The same principle also explains Gn 4²⁶ לְשֵׁת גַּם-הוּא *to Seth, to him also* (not לוֹ-גַּם); cf. 10²¹, and Ex 35³⁴, Nu 4²².

¹ Analogous to this is the resumption of a noun dependent on a preposition, by means of a pronominal suffix united with the same preposition, e.g. Gn 2¹⁷, 2 S 6²², 2 K 22¹⁸, or of an object by means of the *nota accusativi* אֵת with suffix, e.g. 1 S 15⁹ (where וְנִמְאָסָת is certainly to be read), Is 8¹³.

3. The *oblique* cases of the personal pronouns expressed by means of *i* a preposition (or the *nota accus.* אַתְּ) with a suffix may be used either in a demonstrative or reflexive sense,¹ as לִי *to him*, but also *to himself*, e.g. Ju 3¹⁶ and Ehud made לִי *for himself a sword*, cf. Gn 33¹⁷; so also אֵלַי *sibi*, Is 3⁹; אֵלָיו *unto him*, and Gn 8⁹ *unto himself*; אִתּוֹ *with him*, and Gn 22³ *with himself*; עִמָּהּ *with her*, and 1 S 12²⁴ *with herself*; also apparently as a pleonastic *dativus ethicus* (see § 119 *s*), Jb 12¹¹, 13¹.

Rarely, and only when marked emphasis is intended, is the *accusative k* of the reflexive pronoun represented by the *nota accusativi* אַתְּ with a suffix (this being ordinarily expressed by the reflexive conjugations *Niph'al* and *Hithpa'el*²); thus, אַתְּ *se ipsos*, Ex 5¹⁹, Jer 7¹⁹ in sharp antithesis to הֵאֲתִי; Ez 34^{2,8,10}. Cf. § 57 at the end, together with note 2.

Rem. There is a similar emphasis in Is 49²⁶ on בְּשָׁרָם and דָּמָם in the *l* sense of *their own flesh, their own blood*. On the sometimes demonstrative, sometimes reflexive meaning of noun-suffixes of the 3rd person singular and plural, cf. § 91, *p* and *q*. For other circumlocutions to express the idea of *self*, see § 139 *f*.

4. The *possessive pronouns* are, according to § 33 *c*, expressed by *m* the *suffixes of the noun* (in the genitive),³ which may represent either a *subjective genitive*, or (like the genitives proper, § 128 *h*) an *objective genitive*, e.g. הַמַּסִּי *the wrong done against me*, Gn 16⁵, Jer 51³⁵; cf. Gn 9², 18²¹, 27¹³ (2 S 16¹² *Keth.*); Gn 30²³, 39²¹ (cf. Ex 3²¹, &c.); 50⁴, Ex 20²⁰, 21³⁵, Ju 4⁹, 13¹² (מַעֲשֵׂהוּ *the treatment of him*); Is 56⁷, Jer 9⁷, Na 3¹⁹, Pr 1²⁷, 24²², Jb 20²⁹, 23¹⁴, 34⁶. Cf. also such pregnant expressions as פֶּשַׁע עֲזָרְךָ *he will send thy help (help for thee)*, i.e. he will send thee help; Gn 30¹⁸, 39²¹, Ex 2⁹, Is 1²⁶ (*and I will restore judges for thee*); Ez 37¹⁵.

When several substantives are co-ordinated, the pronominal suffix must be attached to each singly, e.g. Gn 36⁶ and Esau took אֶת־נָשָׁיו וְאֶת־בָּנָיו וְאֶת־בָּתָּו *his wives and his sons and his daughters*, &c.; 38¹⁸, &c. In 2 S 23⁵ the text is hardly correct.

¹ As in Luther's Bible *jm* (*ihm*), *jr* (*ihr*) for *sich*, and in our version *him*, *her* for *himself*, *herself*.

² *Niph'al* according to § 51 *e* (like *Hithpa'el* according to § 54 *f*) may also include the *dative* of the reflexive pronoun.

³ Like the substantival genitive, according to § 129 *h*, the possessive pronoun may also be paraphrased by a relative clause, e.g. Ru 2²¹ הַנְּעָרִים אֲשֶׁר לִי *the young men, which are to me*, i.e. *my young men*; so especially, when the substantive, which should take a genitive suffix, is already followed by a genitive, e.g. 1 S 17⁴⁰. In this case, however, the suffix also is sometimes attached pleonastically, e.g. Ct 1⁶ בְּרָמִי שְׁלִי *my vineyard, which belongs to me*. Cf. Ct 3⁷, and the analogous pleonasms in 2 S 22² (but see ψ 18²) and ψ 27².

n 5. When the genitive, following a construct state, is used periphrastically to express the idea of a material or attribute (§ 128 o and p), the pronominal suffix, which properly belongs to the compound idea (represented by the *nomen regens* and genitive), is, like the article (§ 127), attached to the second substantive (the genitive), e.g. הַר-קָדְשִׁי prop. *the hill of my holiness*, i. e. my holy hill, ψ 2⁶, &c.; עִיר קָדְשֶׁךָ *thy holy city*, Dn 9²⁴; אֱלֹהֵי כֶסֶף *his idols of silver*, Is 2²⁰, 30²², 31⁷; ¹ cf. Dt 1⁴¹, Is 9³, 28⁴, 41¹¹, Ez 9^{1f}, ψ 41¹⁰, 150¹, Jb 18⁷ אֲנִי צַעְדֵּי *his steps of strength*; 38⁶; after an adjective as *nomen regens*, Is 13³ (Zp 3¹¹) עֲלֵיוֹ גִּאֲוֹתַי *my proudly exulting ones*.—On the same analogy is the use of e.g. כְּלֵי מִלְחָמָתוֹ Dt 1⁴¹ *his weapons of war* [cf. Is 41¹²]; Is 56⁷ בֵּית תְּפִלָּתִי *my house of prayer*, although the genitive here does not convey the idea of an attribute.

o Rem. 1. Through a weakening in the distinction of gender, which is noticeable elsewhere (cf. § 110 k, 144 a, 145 p, t, u) and which probably passed from the colloquial language² into that of literature, masculine suffixes (especially in the plural) are not infrequently used to refer to feminine substantives; thus a noun-suffix in the singular, Ex 11⁶, 25¹⁹, Ju 11³⁴; ³ in the plural, Gn 31⁹, 32¹⁶, 41²³, Ex 12¹, 2¹⁷, Nu 27⁷ (but the feminine suffix twice immediately after, and so the Samaritan also in verse 7); 36⁶ (Samaritan אֲבִיָּהֶן, but also בְּעֵינֵיהֶם); Ju 19²⁴, 21²², 1 S 67^{10b} (בְּנֵיהֶם); 9²⁰, Is 3¹⁶, Ez 23^{45ff}. (alternating with הֵן); Am 4^{1f}. (but afterwards a feminine suffix); Jb 1¹⁴, 39³ חֲבִלֵיהֶם in parallelism with יִלְרִיָּהֶן); 42¹⁵, Ct 4², 6⁶, Ru 18^{ff}. (along with feminine suffixes); Dn 1⁵, 8⁹. Verbal suffixes in the singular, Ex 22²⁶; in the plural, Ju 16³, Pr 6²¹, Jb 1¹⁵. But Gn 26^{15, 18}, 33¹³, Ex 2¹⁷, 1 S 61^{10a} are to be explained according to § 60 h. On הִמָּה as feminine, see § 32 n. On the use of the masculine in general as the *prior gender*, see § 122 g.

p 2. The suffix of the 3rd person singular feminine (as also the separate pronoun הִיא Nu 14⁴¹, Jos 10¹³, Ju 14⁴) sometimes refers in a general sense to the verbal idea contained in a preceding sentence (corresponding to our *it*); thus the verbal suffix, Gn 15⁶, Nu 23¹⁹, 1 S 11², 1 K 11¹², Is 30⁸, Am 8¹⁰; cf. Gn 24¹⁴ (בָּהּ thereby), 42³⁶, 47²⁶, Ex 10¹¹ (אֹתָהּ that), Is 47⁷. Elsewhere the suffix of the 3rd singular feminine refers to the plurals of things, e.g. 2 K 3³

¹ On the other hand, more explicitly in prose, Gn 44² הַכֶּסֶף נָבִיעַ נָבִיעַ *my cup, the silver cup*.

² According to Diehl (see the title at the head of § 91 a), who adduces numerous instances on pp. 44 ff., 54 ff., 67 f., many of these cases may be set down to corruption of the traditional text, while the sudden (and sometimes repeated) change of gender in suffixes is mainly due to the influence exercised on the copyists by the Mishnic and popular Aramaic dialects, neither of which recognizes such distinctions. Such influence, however, is insufficient to explain the large number of instances of this weakening, occurring even in the earlier documents.

³ The Masora reckons six instances of מִמֶּנּוּ, where מִמֶּנָּה would be expected (Ju 11³⁴, where, however, the text is most probably corrupt), Ex 25¹⁵ (?), Lv 6⁸, 7¹⁸, 27⁹, Jos 17; almost all these passages can, however, be easily explained in other ways.

[but see Kittel; so 13^{2.6.11}; 10²⁶, but LXX מַצְבֶּת], Jer 36²³, Jb 6²⁰ (if the text is correct), 39¹⁵ (but previously תַּחֲמִס), and to the plurals of names of animals, Is 35⁷, Ezr 11⁵. Conversely, plural suffixes refer to collective singulars, e.g. in Gn 15¹³, Nu 16³, 1 S 2⁸, Zp 2⁷ [but read הֵימָּה]; and to a verbal idea contained in the preceding clause, in Ez 33¹⁸, Jb 22²¹ (בָּהֶם thereby), Ez 18²⁶, 33¹⁹ (עָלֵיהֶם on that account, thereby).¹ But the suffix in נָתַנוּ Dt 21¹⁰ refers to the collective idea contained in אֲנִי־יָדֵי; in Jon 1³ עֲמָהֶם refers to the sailors included in sense under the term אֲנִיָּה. In Jos 2⁴ read וְהַתְּפִינִים; in Is 30⁶ (מָהֶם), 38¹⁶, ψ 19⁵ (בָּהֶם) the text is most probably corrupt.

3. In a few examples the force of the noun-suffix or possessive pronoun *q* has become so weak that the language appears to be almost entirely unconscious of it. Thus in אֲדֹנִי *my Lord*, usually explained as being from the *pluralis maiestatis* אֲדֹנִים (§ 124 i) with the suffix of the 1st singular (always with *Qames* to distinguish it from אֲדֹנֵי *my lords*, Gn 15²; but see note below), used exclusively of God, not only in addressing him (Gn 15², 18³, ψ 35²³), but ultimately (see, however, the note below), without any regard to the pronoun, as equivalent to the *Lord*.² On אֲדֹנִי as a *Qrè perpetuum* of the Masoretes for יהוה see § 17 c and § 102 m.

A similar loss of vitality in the suffix is generally assumed in יָחַד prop. *in* *7* *his unitedness*, i.e. *he &c. together*, e.g. כָּל־הָעָם יָחַד Ex 19⁸; then, without regard to the suffix, even after the 1st person אֲנִי־נָתַנוּ יָחַד 1 K 3¹⁸ in reference to two women; Is 41¹, Jb 5³², Neh 6^{2.7}; after the 2nd person, Is 45²⁰, &c. But the supposed pronominal suffix is perhaps rather to be explained, with Brockelmann, *ZA.* xiv. 344 f., as an old adverbial ending, which survives in the Arabic adverbs in *u* and in Assyrian.—Cf. further כָּלָם prop. *their entirely*, but also after the 2nd person equivalent to *all together*, 1 K 22²⁸, Mi 1² (*hear, ye peoples, all of you*; cf. § 144 p), and even before the 2nd person, Jb 17¹⁰ (in 1 S 6⁴ read לָכֶם with the LXX).—On the redundant suffix in הִעָרְבָךְ Lv 27²⁸, cf. § 127 i.

¹ In 2 K 7¹⁰ for שְׁעָרֵי (the LXX had שְׁעָרֵי) read שְׁעָרֵי.

² Cf. the same weakening of the force of the possessive pronoun in רַבִּי prop. *my master*, from the second century A.D. onwards *the master*; so also in Syriac מֵרִי *my lord*, and ultimately as a title *the lord*; in Italian *Madonna*, French *Madame*, *Notre Dame*, *Monsieur*, *Monseigneur*, &c. It can, however, hardly be doubted that the regular distinction between אֲדֹנִי as a holy name, and אֲדֹנִי as an ordinary appellative is merely due to the practice of the later Rabbis. G. H. Dalman, *Der Gottesname Adonaj und seine Geschichte* (Berlin, 1889), in an exhaustive discussion, shows that apart from the book of Daniel and the eight critically doubtful passages, in which אֲדֹנִי is used by God himself, there is nowhere any necessity to regard the suffix as *entirely* meaningless, since אֲדֹנִי is always used either in an address to or (like אֲדֹנִי, which also is never a mere phrase or title) in reverent language about God—as the Lord of the speaker—like the Assyrian *bēli-ia*, *my lord*. Against any original distinction between אֲדֹנִי and אֲדֹנִי it may be urged especially that when unconnected with suffixes the singular אֲדֹנִי is always used of God, and not the *pluralis maiestatis* presupposed by אֲדֹנֵי.

§ 136. The Demonstrative Pronoun.

- a The demonstrative pronouns are **זֶה**, fem. **זֹאת**, plur. **אֵלֶּה** (§ 34), *hic, haec (hoc), hi, &c.*, and the personal pronoun **הוּא**, likewise used as a demonstrative, fem. **הִיא**, plur. masc. **הֵמָּה**, fem. **הֵנָּה** (§ 32 b), *is, ea (id), or ille, &c., ii, eae or illi, &c.* The distinction between them in usage is that **זֶה** (like *hic*, *ῥέ*) almost always points out a (new) person or thing present, while **הוּא** (like *is, ille, αὐτός, ἐκεῖνος*) refers to a person or thing already mentioned or known (see the examples below).¹
- b Rem. 1. Compare the instructive examples in Gn 32³, Ju 7⁴ of *whom I say unto thee, this (זֶה) shall go with thee, he (הוּא) shall go with thee* (so afterwards with negatives). Moreover, **הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** *this day*, i.e. the actual day on which one is speaking or writing (Gn 26³³, &c.), but **הַיּוֹם הַהוּא** the day or period of which the historian has just been speaking (Gn 15¹⁸, 26³²) or of which the prophet has just been foretelling (Is 5³⁰, 7^{18.20 ff.}) and of which he continues to speak or foretell. Nevertheless **זֶה** and **אֵלֶּה** are also found in certain common combinations where **הוּא** and **הֵמָּה** would be expected, and vice versa; thus almost always **הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה**, plur. **הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה**, but **בַּיּוֹמִים הַהֵמָּה** or **בַּיּוֹמִים הָהֵם**.—With a secondary sense of contempt (like Latin *iste*) **זֶה** occurs, e.g. in 1 S 10²⁷, 21¹⁶, 1 K 22²⁷, Is 6¹⁰, &c. In the sense of the neuter, *this*, **זֹאת** is more common than **זֶה**, as Is 5²⁵, 43⁹, &c., but **הוּא** more common than **הִיא**.
- c 2. Both **זֶה** and **הוּא** are sometimes used almost as enclitics to emphasize interrogative words (like the Latin *nam* in *quisnam*; cf. also *quis tandem*); e.g. Jb 38² **מִי זֶה** *who now* (darkeneth, &c.) . . . ? 1 S 17^{55 f.}, Is 63¹, Jer 49¹⁹, ψ 24⁸, 25¹², &c; **מַה־זֶּה** *what now?* 1 S 10¹¹; *how now?* Gn 27²⁰; *why now?* Ju 18²⁴; but before the verb **עָשָׂה** it is usually **מַה־זֹּאת** Gn 3¹³, 12¹⁸, Ex 14⁵, Ju 15¹¹; **לָמָּה־זֶּה** *wherefore now?* Gn 18¹³, 25²², 1 S 17²⁸, 2 S 12²³, &c.—So also **מִי־הוּא** Is 50⁹, Jb 47^{ff.}; and still more emphatically **מִי־הוּא־זֶה** ψ 24¹⁰, Jer 30²¹.
- d 3. **זֶה** is likewise used as an enclitic (see c above): (a) of place, in such passages as Gn 27²¹ **הֲאֵתָהּ זֶה וְגו'** *whether thou (that art here) be my son Esau?* 2 S 2²⁰ *is it thou?* **הִנֵּה־זֶה** *behold, here*, 1 K 19⁵, Is 21⁹; ² cf. also the strengthen-

¹ On **זֶה** and **הוּא** standing separately as determinate in themselves, see § 125 i. On the use of determinate demonstratives as adjectives, see § 126 u.

² On the other hand, it is very questionable whether **זֶה** in ψ 104²⁵ (**זֶה הַיָּם**), Is 23¹³ (**זֶה הַיָּם**), Ju 5⁵, ψ 68⁹ (**זֶה סִינִי**) can be taken, according to the common explanation, simply as a prefixed demonstrative particle (*the sea yonder, &c.*). In ψ 104²⁵ **הַיָּם** may be in apposition to **זֶה**; cf. § 126 aa, on Ex 32¹, and Zc 5⁷, where **אֵשֶׁת אַחֶת** is in apposition to **זֹאת** depending on **הִנֵּה**, and also Ez 40⁴⁵, where **הַלְשָׁבָה** is in apposition to **זֶה**; otherwise it is most naturally taken as the subject, *this is the sea*. Is 23¹³, Ju 5⁵, 1 K 14¹⁴, and ψ 68⁹ might also be explained in the same way; but in these passages the text is almost certainly

ing of the separate pronoun by הוּא Is 43²⁵ (אֲנִי), 1 S 7²⁸, Is 37¹⁶, ψ 44⁵ (אֵתָהּ), and אֵלֶּה these are, Gn 25¹⁶, 1 S 4⁸; (b) of time: עַתָּה הֵנָּה now, 1 K 17²⁴; just now, 2 K 5²²; and rather frequently before words denoting number, e.g. Gn 27³⁶ פַּעַמַּיִם הֵנָּה twice, now; cf. 31³⁸, 2 S 14², Jb 1¹², 7³, 19³; separated from the numeral in Gn 31⁴¹ הֵנָּה-לִּי elliptically for *this*, i.e. this present period, is to me, i.e. makes altogether, twenty years, &c. The other examples are similarly elliptical.

§ 137. The Interrogative Pronoun.

The interrogative pronoun מִי *who* may refer either to a masculine *a* or feminine person (Ct 3⁶), or even to a plural, e.g. אֲהֵם מִי *who are ye?* Jos 9⁸; מִי-אֵלֶּה Gn 33⁵, Nu 22⁹ (more minutely, מִי וְמִי Ex 10⁸, i.e. *who exactly, who in particular?*). It is used of the neuter only when the idea of a person is implied, e.g. מִי-שֶׁבָּם *who are the Shechemites?* Ju 9²⁸, 13¹⁷, Gn 33⁸, Mi 1⁵; even more boldly, with the repetition of a מִי used personally, in 1 S 18¹⁸, 2 S 7¹⁸.—Another interrogative is אֵיזֶה *which, what?*; of persons only in Est 7⁵.

Moreover, מִי may also be used in the sense of a genitive, e.g. בַּת-מִי אַתָּה *whose daughter art thou?* Gn 24²³, 1 S 17^{55, 56, 58}; דְּבַר מִי *whose word?* Jer 44²⁸, 1 S 12³; in the accusative, אֶת-מִי *quemnam?* 1 S 28¹¹, Is 6⁸; with prepositions, e.g. בְּמִי 1 K 20¹⁴ (in an abrupt question *by whom?*); לְמִי Gn 32¹⁸; אַחֲרֵי מִי 1 S 24¹⁵.—Similarly מַה *what?* is used for the nominative, or accusative, or genitive (Jer 8⁹), or with prepositions, e.g. עַל-מַה *whereupon?* Is 1⁵, Jb 38⁶; *why?* Nu 22³², &c.; עַד-מַה *quousque?* ψ 74⁹.¹

Rem. Both מִי and מַה are used also in indirect questions (on the merely *C* relative distinction between direct and indirect questions in Hebrew, see the *Interrogative Sentences*), e.g. Gn 39⁸ (but read מֵאֲדָמָה with Samar. and LXX), 43²², Ex 32¹.—On the meaning of מִי and מַה as interrogatives is based also their use as *indefinite pronouns* (equivalent to *quisquis, quodcunque* or *quicquam*), e.g. Ex 32²⁶, Ju 7³, 1 S 20⁴, Is 50¹⁰ (read יִשְׁמַע in the apodosis), 54¹⁵, Pr 9^{4, 16}, 2 Ch 36²³; even שְׂמֹרְדִי *have a care, whosoever ye be*, 2 S 18¹² (unless לִי is to be read, with the LXX, for מִי); so also מַה (whatever it be) Jb 13¹³, 1 S 19³, 2 S 18^{22, 23}; cf. Nu 23³ מַה-יִרְאֵנִי וְדִבֶּר *and whatsoever he sheweth me*. Cf. also מִי-אִשָּׁר *whosoever* Ex 32³³, 2 S 20¹¹, and מִי-הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר *any man who* Dt 2c^{5ff},

corrupt. In Ju 5⁵ in fact הֵנָּה בְּיָמֵי is most probably to be regarded with Moore as a very early gloss, which subsequently found its way from this passage into ψ 68.

¹ A quite different use of מַה was pointed out (privately) by P. Haupt in Ct 5⁸ *will ye not tell him?* i.e. *I charge you that ye tell him*, and גִּי' = *look now at the Shulamite*, corresponding to the late Arabic *mā tarā, just see! mā taqūlu, say now!* It has long been recognized that מַה is used as a negative in Ct 8⁴.

Ju 10¹⁸. A still further weakening of the *indefinite* use of מָה is the combination מַה-שֵּׁי *that which*, Ec 1⁹, 3¹⁵ (just like the Syriac ܡܐܬܐ); cf. Est 8¹, and מָה . . . בֶּל Pr 9¹³, מָה . . . לֹא Neh 2¹², *nothing whatever*.—On מֵאֲמָרָה *quicquam*, *anything at all* (usually with a negative), and as an adverb in *any way*, 1 S 21³, see the Lexicon.

§ 138. The Relative Pronoun.

Cf. Philippi, *Stat. constr.* (see heading of § 89), p. 71 f., and especially V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894.

a Relative clauses are most frequently (but not necessarily; cf. § 155 b) introduced by the indeclinable אֲשֶׁר (see § 36).¹ This is not, however, a relative pronoun in the Greek, Latin, or English sense, nor is it a mere *nota relationis*,² but an original *demonstrative* pronoun [as though *iste, istius, &c.*].³ Hence it is used—

(1) In immediate dependence on the substantival idea to be defined, and virtually in the same case as it (hence belonging syntactically to the main clause); e. g. Gn 24⁷ . . . הוּא יֵשְׁלַח . . . לְקַחְנִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר לִקְחָנִי the Lord, *iste, he took me . . . he shall send, &c. (= who took me)*; Gn 2² and God finished עָשָׂה מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה his work, *istud, he had made (it)*. Such qualifying clauses may be called *dependent relative clauses*.

b Rem. 1. In the above examples אֲשֶׁר in Gn 24⁷ is virtually in the nominative, in Gn 2² in the accusative. A further distinction between the examples is that in Gn 24⁷ the main idea (יְהוָה), to which אֲשֶׁר is added in apposition, is only resumed in the qualifying clause by the subject (*he*) inherent in

¹ The etymology of the word is still a matter of dispute. Against the identification of אֲשֶׁר, as an original substantive, with the Arabic *ʿatar*, *trace*, Aram. אַתַּר *place, trace*, Nöldeke urges (*ZDMG*, xl. 738) that the expression *trace of . . .* could hardly have developed into the relative conjunction, while the meaning of *place* has been evolved only in Aramaic, where the word is never used as a relative. According to others, אֲשֶׁר is really a compound of several pronominal roots; cf. Sperling, *Die Nota relationis im Hebräischen*, Leipzig, 1876, and König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 323 ff., who follows Ewald and Böttcher in referring it to an original אִשַּׁל. According to Hommel (*ZDMG*, xxxii. 708 ff.) אֲשֶׁר is an original substantive, to be distinguished from אֲשֵׁ and אֲשֵׁ (an original pronominal stem), but used in Hebrew as a *nota relationis*, or (as וְה and וְנ are also sometimes used, see below, g and h) simply for the *relative pronoun*. Baumann (op. cit., p. 44) sees in the Assyrian *ša*, Phoenician, Punic, and Hebrew אֲשֵׁ, the ground-forms, of which the Phoenician and Punic אַש (see above, § 36 note) and the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר are developments.

² E. g. like Luther's use of *so*, in *die fremden Götter, so unter euch sind*, Gn 35².

³ This is the necessary conclusion both from the analogy of the Arabic *ʿalladi*, which is clearly a demonstrative (like the Hebr. הַלְלוּה, הַלְלוּ), and from the use of וְה and וְנ as relatives.

לְקַחְנִי, while in Gn 2² it is not resumed at all. This suppression of the retrospective pronoun¹ takes place especially when it (as in Gn 2²) would represent an accusative of the object, or when it would be a separate pronoun representing a nominative of the subject in a noun-clause, e.g. Gn 1⁷ הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר מִתַּחַת לְרָקִיעַ *the waters, those, under the firmament, &c.* In negative sentences, however, the retrospective pronoun is not infrequently added, e.g. Gn 17¹² הוּא; 7² הִיא; 1 K 9²⁰ הִנֵּה; Dt 20¹⁵ הִנֵּה; but cf. also אֲשֶׁר הוּא חַי Gn 9³. The addition of הִיא in a verbal clause, 2 K 22¹³, is unusual.

The very frequent omission of the retrospective pronoun is noticeable in cases where the predicate of the qualifying clause is a *verbum dicendi*, e.g. Nu 10²⁹ *we are journeying unto the place*, אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה אֲתָן לָכֶם *that place, the Lord said (of it), It will I give to you*; cf. Nu 14⁴⁰, Ju 8¹⁵, 1 S 9^{17,23}, 24⁵, 1 K 8²⁹, Jer 32⁴³.

2. When the substantive, followed by אֲשֶׁר and the qualifying clause, *C* expresses an idea of *place*, it may also be resumed by the adverbs of place שָׁם *there*, שָׁמָּה *thither*, מִשָּׁם *thence*, e.g. Gn 13³ עַד-הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר-הָיָה שָׁם אֹהֶלָה *unto the place, that one, his tent had been there, i.e. where his tent had been*; cf. Gn 3²³ מִשָּׁם, Ex 21¹³ שָׁמָּה. But even in this case the retrospective word may be omitted, cf. Gn 35¹⁴, Nu 20¹³, Is 64¹⁰, where שָׁם would be expected, and Gn 30³⁸, Nu 13²⁷, 1 K 12², where שָׁמָּה would be expected.—When the appositional clause is added to a word of time, the retrospective pronoun is always omitted, e.g. 1 S 20³¹ *for all the days*, אֲשֶׁר בְּנִי-יֵשִׁי חַי *those—the son of Jesse is living (in them)*; cf. Gn 45⁶, Dt 1⁴⁶, 9⁷, 1 K 11⁴²; see Baumann, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

3. If the governing substantive forms part of a statement made in the *d* first or second person, the retrospective pronoun (or the subject of the appositional clause) is in the same person, e.g. Gn 45⁴ *I am Joseph*, אֲשֶׁר-מָכַרְתָּם אֹתִי *he—ye sold me, i.e. whom ye sold*; Nu 22³⁰, Is 49²³; 41⁸ *thou, Jacob*, אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתִּיךָ *he—I have chosen thee*; Jer 32¹⁹, Ec 10^{16f.}; Gn 15⁷ *I am the Lord*, אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ *he—I brought thee out, &c.*, Ex 20² (Dt 5⁶).

(2) Not depending (adjectivally) on a governing substantive, but *e* itself expressing a substantival idea. Clauses introduced in this way may be called *independent relative clauses*. This use of אֲשֶׁר is generally rendered in English by *he who*, *he whom*, &c. (according to the context), or *that which*, &c., or sometimes of *such a kind as* (*qualis*), cf. Ex 14^{13b}, and in a dependent relative clause Is 7¹⁷. In reality, however, the אֲשֶׁר is still a demonstrative belonging to the construction of the main clause as subject or object, or as a genitive dependent on a noun or preposition, e.g. Nu 22⁶ יֹאדָר יֵאָדָר אֲשֶׁר תֵּאָדָר *iste—thou cursest (him)—is cursed, i.e. he whom thou cursest, &c.*; Ex 22⁸; ² אֲשֶׁר as object, Gn 44¹,

¹ The instances in which, instead of a retrospective pronoun, the main idea itself is repeated (Gn 49³⁰, 50¹³, Jer 31³²) are most probably all due to subsequent amplification of the original text by another hand.

² The absolute use of אֲשֶׁר is very peculiar in the formula אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְבַר יְיָ אֵל- *this (is it)—it came as the word of the Lord to . . .*, Jer 14¹, 46¹, 47¹, 49³⁴.

49¹, 1 S 16^{3f}, Mi 6¹ (אֵת אֲשֶׁר); and even preceding the verb, e.g. Is 52¹⁵, ψ 69⁵; אֲשֶׁר as genitive, Ez 23²⁸ *I will deliver thee* בִּיר אֲשֶׁר into the hand of those—thou hatest (them); depending on a preposition, e.g. אֲשֶׁר לְ Gn 44⁴, 2 K 10²²; בְּאֲשֶׁר Gn 21¹⁷, הוּא שָׁם in that (place)—he is there, i.e. where he is; cf. Ju 17⁸ and Ru 1¹⁶ אֶל-אֲשֶׁר whither; ¹ 1 K 18¹⁹ עַל-אֲשֶׁר whither; מֵאֲשֶׁר Ex 5¹¹.

f From these examples it follows that in independent relative clauses the retrospective suffix, or adverb of place, may be, and in fact generally is, omitted. As a rule, however (as in the dependent relative clause), this does not apply to cases in which the retrospective pronoun, by the construction of the sentence, depends on a preposition,² e.g. Gn 44^{9f}. אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא אִתּוֹ . . . וּמָת. *he—it (the cup) is found with him,—shall die* (for the Wāw of the apodosis in וּמָת cf. § 143 d). In such cases אֲשֶׁר preceded by the preposition is quite anomalous, as in Gn 31³² עִם אֲשֶׁר הִמָּצָא with whomsoever thou findest, where אֲשֶׁר is a relative pronoun in the English sense; on the other hand, in Is 47¹² (and probably also 56⁴) בְּאֲשֶׁר is to be explained (with Baumann, op. cit., p. 37) by reference to 47¹⁵, as a demonstrative pronoun, *stand now with thine enchantments . . . , with those—thou hast laboured* (with them).

[With regard to the preceding explanation of אֲשֶׁר, the student will of course understand that, in Hebrew as we know it, אֲשֶׁר never occurs as a mere demonstrative. A particle which, whatever its origin, is uniformly used with reference to something in another, contiguous clause, will naturally have acquired in practice that force which we denote by the term 'relative'.]

g Like the original demonstrative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, the demonstratives proper וְה, וּ, וֹ (the last commonly),³ and sometimes the article, are used somewhat frequently in poetic language to introduce both dependent and independent relative clauses. With regard to the construction of וְה, &c., the remarks on אֲשֶׁר, under *a* and *e*, also hold good.

Examples:—

(a) וְה in apposition to a governing substantive in the nominative, ψ 104²⁶ לְיוֹתָן וְה-יָצַרְתָּ (there is) leviathan, *he—thou hast formed* (him), i.e. *whom thou hast formed*; Is 42²⁴ (וּו); in the accusative, Is 25⁹, ψ 74² (in both cases with a retrospective pronoun; וּו is used without it in ψ 132¹²); in apposition to a genitive dependent on a preposition, Pr 23²² יִלְדָּךְ וְה לְאָבִיךָ הִשְׁמַע *hearken unto thy father, him—he begat thee*, i.e. *who begat thee*; ψ 17⁹ (וּו).—In ψ 104⁸ אֶל-מָקוֹם וְה יָסַדְתָּ לָּהֶם *unto the place which thou hadst founded for them* (cf. § 130 c), וְה is in the genitive after the construct state מָקוֹם to the place of that, thou hadst

¹ In Zc 12¹⁰ also, instead of the unintelligible אֵלֵי אֵת אֲשֶׁר, we should probably read אֶל-אֲשֶׁר, and refer the passage to this class.

² Such a strong ellipsis as in Is 31⁶, where מִפְּנֵי would be expected after הַעֲמִיק, is only possible in elevated poetic or prophetic language.

³ The etymological equivalent דִּי, דְּ in Aramaic is always a relative.

founded (it) for them; on the same analogy we may also take, with Baumann (op. cit., p. 48), ψ 78⁵⁴ (חַר־וְהָ) and Ex 15¹³ (עַם־יִזְרָאֵל), 15¹⁶, Is 43²¹, ψ 9¹⁶, 10², 31⁵, 32⁸, 62¹², 142⁴, 143⁸ (all examples of וְהָ).

To introduce independent relative clauses וְהָ is used as a nominative in *h* Jb 19¹⁹; as accusative, Jb 15¹⁷ and וְהָ Hb 11¹¹, ψ 68²⁹ (after a preposition, וְהָ Ex 13⁸; but the text is evidently corrupt).

(b) More certain examples of the use of the article as a relative pronoun *i* (more correctly, perhaps, of the demonstrative which is otherwise used as article) are 1 Ch 26²⁸ בָּלֹהֶם הַחֲקָדִישִׁים שְׁמוֹאֵל all that Samuel had dedicated, &c.; 1 Ch 29⁸ (where בָּמִצָּע can only be perfect Niph'al); 2 Ch 29³⁶, Ezr 10¹⁴. In connexion with a plural, Jos 10²⁴ הַחֲלָכִים אִתּוֹ the chiefs of the men of war who went with him; Ezr 8²⁵, 10¹⁷, 1 Ch 29¹⁷. Finally, in the sense of *id quod*, Jer 5¹³ (where, however, we should read with the LXX הַדָּבָר). Cf. moreover, 1 S 9²⁴ הַתֵּיִשָׁרִים and that which was upon it (but see *k* below); 2 Ch 1⁴ בְּהֵכֵן equivalent to בְּמָשְׁכַּן הַכֵּן to the place, that he had prepared.

In all the examples adduced except 1 S 9²⁴ (where הַתֵּיִשָׁרִים should probably *k* be read for הַתֵּיִשָׁרִים) the ה is followed by undoubted perfects; almost all the examples, moreover, belong to the latest Books (Ezra and Chronicles). On the other hand, another series of instances (even in the older texts) is extremely doubtful, in which the Masora likewise requires perfects, either by placing the tone on the penultima, as in Gn 18²¹, 46²⁷, Jb 21¹¹ הַבָּצָה; Is 51¹⁰ הַשִּׁבְחָה; Ez 26¹⁷ הַחֲלָלָה Ru 1²², 2⁶ and 4⁸ הַשִּׁבְכָה, or by the punctuation, Gn 21⁸ הַנּוֹלֵד; 1 K 11⁹, Dn 8¹ הַנִּרְאָה; Is 56³ הַנְּלִיָּה, while no doubt the authors in all these cases intended participles (and in fact perfect participles, cf. § 116 *d*) with the article, thus הַבָּצָה, &c., Ez 26¹⁷ הַחֲלָלָה for הַמְחַלְלָה according to § 52 *s*, and in the other examples הַנּוֹלֵד, הַנִּרְאָה, הַנְּלִיָּה.

§ 139. Expression of Pronominal Ideas by means of Substantives.

Analogous to the periphrases for expressing materials and attributes *a* by means of substantives (§ 128 *o* and *p*), is the use of substantives to represent certain kinds of pronominal ideas, for which no special expressions exist. Thus—

1. אִישׁ, אִשָּׁה *man, woman*, are used to express—

(a) The idea of *each, every* (in the sense of each severally) with reference to persons,¹ and even animals (Gn 15¹⁰), e.g. Gn 10⁵, feminine Ex 3²²; אִשָּׁה is the object, e.g. in Jer 12¹⁵. On אִישׁ—אִישׁ cf. § 123 *c*.

In a few passages אִישׁ in the above sense is placed for the sake of emphasis *c* before the governing noun (always a substantive with a suffix), thus מִיִּדְּאִישׁ מִיִּדְּאִישׁ before the governing noun (always a substantive with a suffix), thus מִיִּדְּאִישׁ מִיִּדְּאִישׁ Gn 9⁵, according to the usual explanation, stands for מִיִּדְּאִישׁ אֶחָד at the hand of the brother of every man. But although the explanation seems to be

¹ As a rule אִישׁ is used in the particularizing sense of *each man*, with the plural of the verb, e.g. Gn 44¹¹; sometimes, however, as subject to a verb in the singular, e.g. Gn 44¹³.

supported by Gn 42²⁵ and Nu 17¹⁷, it is inconceivable that such an inversion of *nomen regens* and *rectum* should occur. It is more likely, either that the second substantive is in apposition to אִישׁ (thus Gn 9⁵ *at the hand of every man, his brother*, [unless it is a combination of the two readings מִיִּד אִישׁ and מִיִּד הָאָדָם]; similarly 15¹⁰ *and he laid each or, more exactly, one piece of it, &c.*, and so probably also Nu 17¹⁷ *every one*, sc. *his name*), or אִישׁ precedes as a kind of *casus pendens*, and only receives its nearer definition from the following substantive with suffix; thus Gn 41¹², 42²⁵ (according to the context = *to every one in his sack*); 42³⁵, where צָרוּר-בְּסָפוֹ בְּשָׁקוֹ is virtually the predicate of אִישׁ; Ex 12⁴, 28²¹, Nu 5¹⁰, 26⁵⁴, 2 K 23³⁵, and especially Zc 7¹⁰.¹

d (b) *Any one, some one*, e.g. Gn 13¹⁶, Ct 8⁷, with a negative *no one*; ² so after אֶל- Ex 16^{19,29}; before לֹא Gn 23⁶ and frequently.—Instead of אִישׁ we sometimes find in a similar sense אָדָם *man, homo*, e.g. Lv 1² (cf. בְּאַחֵר הָאָדָם *as any one else*, Ju 16^{7,11}), נַפֶּשׁ (*soul*) *person*, Lv 2¹, 5¹, &c., and in a neuter sense דָּבָר (*prop. word, thing*) for *anything*, Gn 18¹⁴, or כָּל-דָּבָר Lv 5², Nu 31²³. With a negative דָּבָר means *nothing*; thus after אֶל- Gn 19⁸; after לֹא Ec 8⁵.—Cf. finally, מִאֶחָד *any one*, Dt 15⁷; *anything*, Ez 18¹⁰ (but in Lv 4², 5¹³ מִאֶחָת) and the expressions noticed in § 144 e. The latter include also instances like Ez 18³² *I have no pleasure בְּמוֹת הַיּוֹם in the death of him that dieth, i.e. of any man.*

e (c) In connexion with אחיו *his brother* or רֵעֵהוּ *his neighbour*, אִישׁ *one, masc.* (as אִשָּׁה *one, fem.*, in connexion with אחותה *her sister* or רֵעוּתָהּ *her neighbour*) is used to represent the ideas of *alter—alter, the one—the other*³ (in reference to persons, animals, or things without life; see the Lexicon) or the idea of *one another*, e.g. Gn 13¹¹ *and they separated themselves מֵעַל אֶחָיו the one from the other*; Ex 26³ *five curtains (יריעת) shall be coupled together אֶל-אַחֲתָהּ one to another.*

f 2. נַפֶּשׁ *soul, person* expresses the idea of *self*,⁴ both in the singular, Pr 19^{6,16}, 29²⁴, Jb 18⁴ (in all cases נַפְשׁוֹ equivalent to *himself*) and in the plural, Jer 37⁹, &c. Similar to this is the use of בְּקִרְבָּהּ Gn 18¹² (*prop. in her inward part*) in the sense of *within herself*.⁵

¹ Cf. on the whole question the thorough discussion by Budde, *Die bibl. Urgeschichte*, p. 283 ff.: according to him, the words in Gn 9⁵ are to be rendered *at the hand of one another* (from men mutually) *will I require it*. [In support of this view, Budde points to Zc 7¹⁰ וְרַעַת אִישׁ אֶחָיו אֶל-תַּחֲשָׁבוֹ, וְאִישׁ אֶת-רַעַת רֵעֵהוּ אֶל-תַּחֲשָׁבוֹ בְּלִבְבָּכֶם, which in the light of 8¹⁷, בְּלִבְבָּכֶם, can only, he observes, be rendered ‘and devise not the hurt of one another in your heart’. So also König, *Syntax*, § 33.]

² Cf. also אִין-אִישׁ Gn 39¹¹. On the expression of the idea of *no one* by means of אִין with a following participle, see the *Negative Sentences*, § 152 l.

³ Elsewhere הָאֶחָד . . . הָאֶחָד are used in a similar sense, Ex 14²⁰, Is 6⁸; also הָאֶחָד . . . הָאֶחָד 2 S 14⁶, or the substantive is repeated, e.g. Gn 47²¹ (*from one end . . . to the other end*).

⁴ On the representation of this idea by pronouns, separate and suffixed, see § 135 a, i and k.

⁵ In a similar way the idea of *self* in Arabic, as in Sanskrit (*âtman*), is paraphrased by *soul, spirit*; in Arabic also by *eye*; in Rabbinic by גּוּף *body*,

3. **בְּעֵצָם** *bone* (then metaphorically for *substance*) expresses the idea of *self*, *g* *selfsame*, *very same*, in reference to *things* (as **נִפְשׁוֹ** to persons, e.g. **הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה בְּעֵצָם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** *in the selfsame day*, Gn 7¹³, cf. Jos 10²⁷, Ez 24²; **כְּעֵצָם הַשָּׁמַיִם לְטָהָר** *as it were the very heaven for clearness*, Ex 24¹⁰; **בְּעֵצָם חֲמוּזוֹ** *in the very fullness of his strength* (= *in the midst of his full strength*), Jb 21²³).

4. The simple plural of words denoting time sometimes includes also the *h* idea of *a few*, *some*;¹ thus **יָמִים** *a few days*, Gn 24⁵⁵, 40⁴ (here even of a longer period, = *for some time*); Is 65²⁰, Dn 8²⁷ (on the other hand, Gn 27⁴⁴, 29²⁰ **יָמִים אַחֲרָיִם**; see § 96 under **אַחֲרָיִם**); **שָׁנִים** *some years*, Dn 11^{6,8}.

בְּרֶגֶל or **בְּעֵצָם** *bone*, in Ethiopic and Amharic by *head*, in Egyptian by *mouth*, *hand*, &c.; cf. also the Middle High German *min lip*, *din lip*, for *ich*, *du*. However, **נִפְשׁוֹ** in such cases is never (not even in Is 46² **נִפְשָׁם** *they themselves*) a merely otiose periphrasis for the personal pronoun, but always involves a reference to the *mental* personality, as affected by the senses, desires, &c.

¹ *Some* in reference to persons in Ex 16²⁰ is expressed by **אֲנִישֵׁי**, and in Neh 5²⁻⁴ by **יֵשׁ אִשְׁרָךְ** *sunt qui*, with a participle following.

CHAPTER II

THE SENTENCE

I. The Sentence in General.

§ 140. *Noun-clauses, Verbal-clauses, and the Compound Sentence.*

- a* 1. Every sentence, the subject and predicate of which are nouns or their equivalents (esp. participles), is called a *noun-clause*, e. g. יהוה מלכנו *the Lord is our king*, Is 33²²; ואנשי סדם רעים וחמאים *now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners*, Gn 13¹³; פה להם *a mouth is theirs*, ψ 115⁵; see further, § 141.
- b* 2. Every sentence, the subject of which is a noun (or pronoun included in a verbal-form) and its predicate a finite verb, is called a *verbal-clause*, e. g. ויאמר אלהים *and God said*, Gn 1³; ויבדל *and he divided*, 1⁷; see further, § 142.
- c* Rem. In the last example the pronominal subject is at least indicated by the preformative (י), and in almost all forms of the perfect by affirmatives. The 3rd pers. sing. perf. however, which contains no indication of the subject, must also be regarded as a full verbal-clause.
- d* 3. Every sentence, the subject or predicate of which is itself a full clause, is called a *compound sentence*, e. g. ψ 18³¹ האל תמים דרכו *God—his way is perfect*, equivalent to *God's way is perfect*; Gn 34⁸ שכם בני חשקה נפשו בבתכם *my son Shechem—his soul longeth for your daughter*; see further, § 143.
- e* 4. The above distinction between different kinds of sentences—especially between noun- and verbal-clauses—is indispensable to the more delicate appreciation of Hebrew syntax (and that of the Semitic languages generally), since it is by no means merely external or formal, but involves fundamental differences of meaning. Noun-clauses with a substantive as predicate, represent something *fixed*, a *state* or in short, a *being* so and so; verbal-clauses on the other hand, something *moveable* and *in progress*, an *event* or *action*. The latter description is indeed true in a certain sense also of noun-clauses

with a participial predicate, except that in their case the event or action (as distinguished from that expressed by the verbal-clause) is of a fixed and abiding character.

Rem. By the Arab grammarians every clause beginning with an independent subject is regarded as a noun-clause, and every clause beginning with a finite verb as verbal. If a finite verb follows the noun-subject the two together (since the verb comprises its own subject and is thus a complete verbal-clause) form a compound noun-sentence, just as when the predicate consists of an independent noun-clause. Though this definition of the different kinds of sentence, which we formerly accepted (in § 144 *a* of the 22nd to the 24th German editions of this Grammar), is rejected above, *a-d*, we must, nevertheless, mention here the point in which this more complicated view of the Arab grammarians may be regarded as at least relatively correct, namely, in classifying verbal-clauses according as the subject precedes or follows the verb, a distinction which is often of great importance in Hebrew also; see further, in § 142 *a*.

§ 141. *The Noun-clause.*

1. The *subject* of a noun-clause (see § 140 *a*) may be— *a*

(*a*) A substantive, e.g. וְנָהָר יָצָא מֵעֵדֶן and a river went out (was going out) of Eden, Gn 2¹⁰.

(*b*) A pronoun, e.g. Gn 7⁴ אֲנֹכִי מְטִיר I will cause it to rain; 14¹⁸ כֹּהֵן וְהוּא and he was priest; 2²³ זֹאת before a feminine predicate, as אֵלֶּה before a plural in Ex 32⁴; 14¹⁰ מִי חָכָם who is wise? Ho 14¹⁰.—In 1 Ch 5² וּלְנִגִּיר מִפָּנָיו and of him one became a prince, the subject is contained in מִפָּנָיו.¹

2. The *predicate* of a noun-clause may be— *b*

(*a*) A substantive, e.g. Dt 14¹ אַתֶּם בָּנִים וְגו' ye are children of the Lord your God; Gn 42¹³. Specially characteristic of the Semitic mode of expression are the cases in which both subject and predicate are substantives, thus emphasizing their identity ('the thing is its measure, material, or equivalent'), e.g. Ez 41²² עֵץ וְקִירָתוֹ עֵץ ... the altar (was) wood . . . , and the walls thereof (were) wood, i. e. of wood. Cf. below, *c*.

(*b*) An adjective or participle, e.g. Gn 2¹² וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה טוֹבָה and the gold of that land is good; Gn 31¹⁰.² Very frequently such noun-clauses, attached by *Wāw* to a verbal-clause, are used to represent a state contemporaneous with the principal action; cf. *e* below.

(*c*) A numeral, e.g. Gn 42¹³ עֶשֶׂר עֲבָדָיךָ the twelve (of us) are thy servants.

¹ For other remarkable instances of ellipse in the Chronicler, see Driver, *Introduction*, ed. 8, p. 537, no. 27.

² Cf. the numerous examples in § 116 *n-p*.

(d) A pronoun, e.g. Gn 10¹² (הֵיאָה), Ex 9²⁷ (אֵינִי), Gn 24⁶⁵ (מִי), 1 K 9¹³ (מֶה).¹

(e) An adverb or (esp. if formed with a preposition) any specification of time, place, quality, possessor, &c., which may be regarded as the equivalent of a noun-idea, e.g. שָׁם הָבֵלֶךְ there is the bdellium, Gn 2¹²; אֵי הָבֵל where is Abel? 4⁹; לְעוֹלָם חֶסֶדוֹ his mercy endureth for ever, ψ 136¹¹; עֲשֵׂר בְּבֵיתוֹ riches are in his house, ψ 112³; לוֹ אֲנַחְנוּ we are his, ψ 100³ Q^{erê}.

C Rem. 1. The employment of a substantive as predicate of a noun-clause is especially frequent, either when no corresponding adjective exists (so mostly with words expressing the material; cf. § 128 o) or when the attribute is intended to receive a certain emphasis. For in all cases there is a much greater stress upon a substantival predicate,² since it represents something as identical with the subject (see above, b [a]), than upon an adjectival or verbal predicate; cf. Ct 1¹⁰; ψ 25¹⁰ all the paths of the Lord are חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת lovingkindness and truth (i.e. wholly lovingkindness, &c.; cf. Jer 10¹⁰); Ez 38⁵, ψ 10⁵, 19¹⁰, 23⁵, 88¹⁹, Pr 3¹⁷,³ Jb 22¹², 23², 26¹³, Ru 3². Sometimes the emphasis on the predicate is obtained by the use of the plural form (according to § 124 e), e.g. ψ 110³ thy people are נִרְבָּח altogether willingness; Ct 5¹⁶, Dn 9²³.

d Sometimes the boldness of such combinations is modified by the repetition of the subject, as regens of the predicate, e.g. Jb 6¹² אִמְצָתָם אֲבִנִים פָּחִי is my strength the strength of stones? Pr 3¹⁷. That the language, however—especially in poetry—is not averse even to the boldest combinations in order to emphasize very strongly the unconditional relation between the subject and predicate, is shown by such examples as ψ 45⁹ myrrh and aloes and cassia are all thy garments (i.e. so perfumed with them that they seem to be composed of them); Ct 1¹⁵ thine eyes are doves, i.e. dove's eyes (but 5¹² בְּיוֹנִים);⁴ ψ 23⁵, 109⁴, Jb 8⁹, 12¹², Ct 2¹³. In prose, e.g. Ex 9³¹, Ezr 10¹³ הָעֵת נִשְׁמִים the season is rain showers, i.e. the rainy season; with a bold enallage of the number, Gn 34³⁰ וְאֵנִי מִתִּי מִסְפָּר and I (with my family) am persons few in number. For similarly bold expressions with הָיָה cf. Gn 11¹, 12², Ex 17¹², Is 5¹², Jer 2²⁸, and again with a bold enallage of the number, Jb 29¹⁵ I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame, but in prose, Nu 10³¹ and thou shalt be to us לְעֵינֵינוּ.

¹ Why in these examples the pronouns, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, are to be considered as predicates and not as subjects, may be seen from what has been remarked above, § 126 k.

² The same naturally applies to most of those cases which are not pure noun-clauses, but have the substantival predicate connected with the subject by הָיָה (e.g. Gn 1² and the earth was a waste and emptiness; cf. ψ 35⁶, Pr 8³⁰, Jb 3⁴) or where a preposition precedes the substantival predicate, as ψ 29⁴ the voice of the Lord is with power, i.e. powerful.

³ שָׁלוֹם here, as in Jb 21⁹, is evidently a substantive after a plural subject; on the other hand, it is doubtful whether שָׁלוֹם in such passages as Gn 43²⁷, 2 S 20⁹, ψ 120⁷, &c., is not rather to be regarded as an adjective.

⁴ As a rule, in such comparisons בְּ (which is then to be regarded as nominative) stands before the predicate, e.g. Is 63² wherefore are thy garments בְּנֵת בְּרֹדֶף like those of one that treadeth in the wine-press? (prop. the like of one that treadeth, instar calcantis); Jer 50⁹. The comparison is then much less emphatic than in the noun-clauses cited above.

2. The noun-clause connected by *wāw copulative* to a verbal-clause, or its equivalent, always describes a state *contemporaneous* with the principal action, or (when the predicate is a transitive participle) an action represented in constant duration (cf. § 107 d, as well as § 116 n and o), e.g. Gn 19¹ *and the two angels came to Sodom at even*, וְלוֹט יֹשֵׁב *while Lot sat*, &c.; 18^{1.8.16.22}, 25²⁶, Ju 13⁹, 1 S 1⁹, 2 S 4⁷, 11⁴ (always with a participle); with an adjectival predicate, Gn 18¹²; with a substantival predicate, 18²⁷; with an adverbial predicate, 9²³. Not infrequently such a *circumstantial* clause indicates at the same time some contradictory fact, so that וְ is equivalent to *whereas*, *whilst*, *although*, e.g. Gn 15², 18²⁷, 2c³, 48¹⁴ (*although he was the younger*); Ju 16¹⁵ *how canst thou say, I love thee*, וְלִבִּי אֵין אִתִּי *whereas thine heart is not with me?* 2 S 3³⁹, ψ 28³ *whilst mischief is in their hearts*. These clauses describing a state are, however, only a subdivision of the large class of circumstantial clauses, on which see § 156.

3. As the examples given under *a* and *b* show, the syntactical *f* relation existing between the subject and predicate of a noun-clause is as a rule expressed by simple juxtaposition, without a *copula* of any kind. To what period of time the statement applies must be inferred from the context; e.g. 1 K 18²¹ יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים *the Lord is the true God*; 1 S 9¹⁹; Is 31² גַּם-הוּא חָכָם *yet he also is wise*; Gn 42¹¹; on the other hand, Gn 19¹ וְלוֹט יֹשֵׁב *and (=while) Lot was sitting*; Ez 28¹⁵; Gn 7⁴ אֲנִי מֵמַטֵּיר *I am raining*, i. e. *I will rain*. Sometimes even a jussive or optative is to be supplied as predicate, Gn 27¹³ *upon me be thy curse*; Gn 11³, 20¹³, Ex 12². Cf. § 116 r, note.

Not infrequently, however, a connexion is established between subject *g* and predicate (*a*) by adding the separate pronoun of the 3rd person singular or plural, expressly resuming and therefore strengthening the subject, or (*b*) (especially for the sake of a more exact specification of time) by the help of the verb הָיָה. The first of these will be a *compound* sentence, since the predicate to the main subject consists of an independent clause.

Examples of (*a*): Gn 41²⁶ הֵנָּה שִׁבְעַת שָׁנִים הֵנָּה *they are seven h years*; Dt 1⁷, 4²⁴; Ec 5¹⁸ הוּא מִתַּת אֱלֹהִים הוּא *this—it is a gift of God*; Nu 3²⁷ הֵם אֱלֹהֵי הָעָם; in a question, Gn 27³⁸. Sometimes הוּא is used in this way to strengthen a pronominal subject of the first or second person, and at the same time to connect it with the predicate which follows,¹ e.g. אֲנִי אֲנִי הוּא *I, even I, am he that blotteth out*, &c.; 51¹²; אֲתָה הוּא 2 S 7²⁸, Is 37¹⁶, ψ 44⁵, Neh 9^{6.7}; in an interrogative sentence, Jer 14²²;² in Jer 49¹² הוּא *in a verbal-clause* strengthens אֲתָה.

¹ On a similar use of the separate pronoun of the third person in Aramaic (Dn 2³⁸, Ezr 5¹¹, &c.) see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 87. 3.

² This is of course to be distinguished from the use of הוּא (to be inferred from the context) as predicate in the sense of ὁ αὐτός; see above, § 135 a, note 1; or such cases as Dt 32³⁹ *see now* אֲנִי אֲנִי הוּא *that I, even I, am he*; 1 Ch 21¹⁷.

i Of (b): naturally this does not apply to the examples, in which הָיָה, in the sense of *to become, to fare, to exist*, still retains its full force as a verb, and where accordingly the sentence is verbal, and not a noun-clause; especially when the predicate precedes the subject. On the other hand, such examples as Gn 1² and the earth was (הָיְתָה) waste and emptiness, can scarcely be regarded as properly verbal clauses; הָיְתָה is used here really only for the purpose of referring to past time a statement which, as the description of a state, might also appear in the form of a pure noun-clause; cf. Gn 3¹. This is especially true of the somewhat numerous instances in which הָיָה occurs as a connecting word between the subject and the participial predicate; e. g. Ju 1⁷, Jb 1¹⁴ (immediately afterwards a pure noun-clause). The imperfect of הָיָה announces what is future in Nu 14³³, &c.; cf. § 116 r. However, especially in the latter case, הָיָה is not wholly without verbal force, but comes very near to being a mere copula, and this use is more frequent in the later books¹ than in the earlier.

k Rem. On the employment of הָיָה existence, and אֵין non-existence, which were originally substantives (on their tendency to be used as verbs, equivalent to *est*, and *non est*, cf. § 100 o, and the *Negative Sentences*, § 152) as a connecting link between a pronominal subject and a participial predicate (especially in conditional and interrogative sentences, Gn 24^{42,49}, 43⁴, &c.), see above, § 116 g, and the various kinds of subordinate clauses mentioned in §§ 150, 159.

l 4. The natural arrangement of words in the noun-clause, as describing a state, is *subject—predicate*; the principal stress falls on the former since it is the object of the description. Very frequently, however (and not merely in poetry, where greater freedom is naturally allowed in the arrangement of words), the reverse order is found, i. e. *predicate—subject*. The latter order *must* be used when special emphasis is laid on the predicate,² or when it consists of an interrogative word; thus with a substantival predicate, e. g. Gn 3¹⁰ עָפָר אָתָּה dust thou art; 4⁹, 12¹³ (my sister, not my wife); 20^{2,12}, 29¹⁴, Is 6^{3b}, Jb 5²⁴, 6¹²; with an adjectival predicate, e. g. Is 6^{3a}, 28²¹, Jer 10⁶; with a participle, Gn 30¹, 32¹²; with an interrogative pronoun, e. g. Gn 24⁶⁵; ³ with an adverbial interrogative, e. g. Gn 4⁹.

m Rem. On the above cf. the exhaustive investigations of C. Albrecht, 'Die Wortstellung im hebr. Nominalsatz,' ZAW. vii. 218 ff. and viii. 249 ff.; with a complete list of the exceptions to the order *subject—predicate*, p. 254 ff. The predicate *must* precede for the reasons stated (an *adjectival predicate* is particularly emphatic when it has the force of a comparative, e. g. Gn 4¹³; the predicate expressed by means of a preposition precedes most frequently when it serves to convey the ideas of *having, possessing*, e. g. Gn 18¹⁴, 29¹⁶, &c.; cf. also 26²⁰, 31^{16,43}).

n The predicate *may* precede: (a) when the subject is a pronoun, for 'the person assumed to be generally known, does not excite the same interest as

¹ According to Albrecht, ZAW. viii. 252, especially in Deuteronomy and in the Priestly Code.

² For the same reason specifications of place (e. g. Gn 4⁷) or other adverbial qualifications may stand at the beginning of the sentence.

³ The only exceptions, according to Albrecht (see the Rem. above), are Ex 16^{7,8}.

that which is stated about him ;' (b) 'in order not to be a mere appendage to a subject which consists of several words,' e.g. 2 K 20¹⁹; (c) in interrogative sentences (with a substantival or adjectival predicate or one compounded with a preposition), e.g. 1 S 16⁴; finally (d) in a relative clause, when the predicate is adverbial or compounded with a preposition, as a rule closely united (by Maqqeph) with אֲשֶׁר, e.g. Gn 2¹¹ אֲשֶׁר-נָשָׂא; 1^{29f}. אֲשֶׁר-בֶּן.

§ 142. The Verbal-clause.

1. By § 140 *f* there is an essential distinction between verbal-*a* clauses, according as the subject stands before or after the verb. In the verbal-clause proper the principal emphasis rests upon the action which proceeds from (or is experienced by) the subject, and accordingly the verb naturally precedes (*necessarily* so when it is in the perf. consec. or imperf. consec.). Nevertheless, the subject does sometimes precede even in the verbal-clause proper, in the continuation of the narrative, e.g. Gn 7¹⁹, 2 S 19¹²; especially so if there is special emphasis upon it, e.g. Gn 3¹³ (it is not I who am to blame, but) *the serpent beguiled me*, cf. Gn 2⁵, &c.¹ In the great majority of instances, however, the position of the subject at the beginning of a verbal-clause is to be explained from the fact that the clause is not intended to introduce a new fact carrying on the narrative, but rather to describe a *state*. Verbal-clauses of this kind approximate closely in character to noun-clauses, and not infrequently (*viz.* when the verbal form might just as well be read as a participle) it is doubtful whether the writer did not in fact intend a noun-clause.

The particular *state* represented in the verb may consist—

b

(a) Of an act completed long before, to which reference is made only because it is necessary for understanding the sequel of the principal action. If the predicate be a perfect (as it almost always is in these cases), it is generally to be rendered in English by a pluperfect; cf. the examples discussed above in § 106 *f* (1 S 28³, &c.); also Gn 6⁸ (not *Noah found grace*); 16¹, 18¹⁷, 20⁴, 24¹, 39¹ (and *Joseph in the meanwhile had been brought down to Egypt*); 41¹⁰, Ju 1¹⁶, 1 S 9¹⁵, 14²⁷, 25²¹, 1 K 1¹, &c.—In a wider sense this applies also to such verbal-clauses as Gn 2⁶ (see further, § 112 *e*), since when they serve to represent an action continuing for a long period in the past, and thus to some extent a *state*.

(b) Of a fact, contemporaneous with the principal events or continuing as *C* the result of them. To the former class belong all those instances in which the predicate is combined with הָיָה (provided that הָיָה has not, as in Gn 1², 3¹, &c., been weakened to a mere copula, in which case the precedence of the subject is fully explained from the character of the clause as a noun-clause; cf. § 141 *i*, and the examples of הָיָה, &c., with a participle, § 116 *r*); as an example of the second class, cf. e.g. Gn 13¹² אַבְרָם יָשָׁב בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן וְגו' *Abraham accordingly continued to dwell in the land of Canaan, but Lot dwelt, &c.*

¹ This of course applies also to the cases, in which the subject consists of a strongly emphasized personal pronoun, e.g. Gn 32¹³ אַתָּה *thou thyself*; 33³ הוּא *he himself*.

d Rem. 1. The close relation between verbal-clauses beginning with the subject and actual noun-clauses, is seen finally from the fact that the former also are somewhat frequently added with **וְ** (or subordinated) to a preceding sentence in order to lay stress upon some accompanying circumstance; on such noun-clauses describing a *state* or *circumstance*, cf. § 141 *e*. This is especially the case, again, when the circumstantial appendage involves an antithesis; cf. Gn 18¹⁸ *seeing that nevertheless Abraham shall surely become, &c.*; 24⁵⁶, 26²⁷, Is 29¹³, Jer 14¹⁵, ψ 50¹⁷, Jb 21²², and such examples as Gn 4^{2,4}, 29¹⁷, where by means of **וְ** a new subject is introduced in express antithesis to one just mentioned. Moreover, in the examples treated above, under *b* and *c* (1 S 28³, &c.), the subject is frequently introduced by **וְ**, which then corresponds to the Greek $\delta\epsilon$, used to interpose an explanation, &c., see Winer, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, § 53. 7 *b*.

e 2. By a peculiar construction verbal-clauses may be joined by means of **וְ** and a following subject to participial clauses, e.g. Gn 38²⁵ **וְהָיָה מִצָּאָתָהּ וְהָיָה שְׁלָחָהּ** *she was already brought forth, when she sent, &c.*; 44^{3,4}, Ju 18³, 19¹¹, 2 S 20⁸; for other examples, see § 116 *u* (where it is pointed out, note 1, that the apodosis also frequently appears in the form of a *noun*-clause, a further proof of the close relation between verbal-clauses beginning with the subject and noun-clauses proper). Without doubt there is in all these cases a kind of inversion of the principal clause and the temporal subordinate clause; the latter for the sake of greater emphasis being raised to an independent noun-clause, while the real principal action is added as though it were an accompanying circumstance, and hence in the form of an ordinary circumstantial clause. [Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 166 ff.]

f 2. According to what has been remarked above, under *a*, the natural order of words within the verbal sentence is: *Verb—Subject*, or *Verb—Subject—Object*. But as in the noun-clause (§ 141 *l*) so also in the verbal-clause, a variation of the usual order of words frequently occurs when any member of the sentence is to be specially emphasized by priority of position.¹ Thus the order may be:—

(*a*) *Object—Verb—Subject*: Gn 30⁴⁰, 37⁴, 1 S 15¹, 2 K 23¹⁹ and frequently. Naturally the examples are far more numerous, in which the object precedes a verbal form which includes the subject in itself, e.g. Gn 3^{10,14,18}, 6¹⁶, 8¹⁷, 9¹³, Ex 18²³, Ju 14³, 1 S 18¹⁷, 20⁹, 2 I¹⁰, 2 K 22⁸, Pr 13⁵, &c.

(*b*) *Verb—Object—Subject*: Gn 21⁷, Nu 5²³, 1 S 15³³, 2 S 24¹⁶ (but **הַמְלֶאֱכָר** is probably only a subsequent addition); Is 19¹³, ψ 34²², Jb 11¹⁹, &c.

(*c*) *Subject—Object—Verb*: Is 3¹⁷, 11⁸, 13¹⁸, Ho 12¹¹, ψ 6¹⁰, 11⁵, Jb 29²⁵.²

¹ Not infrequently also the striving after *chiasmus* mentioned in § 114 *r*, note, occasions a departure from the usual arrangement of words.

² This sequence occurs even in prose (Gn 17⁹, 23⁶, &c.); it is, however, more doubtful here than in the above prophetic and poetical passages, whether the preceding subject should not be regarded rather as the subject of a compound sentence (§ 143), the predicate of which is an independent verbal-clause; this would explain why the verbal-clause is usually separated from the subject by one of the greater disjunctives.—On the other hand, the sequence *Subject—Object—Verb* is quite common in Aramaic (e.g. Dn 27¹⁰); cf.

(d) *Object—Subject—Verb* (very rarely): 2 K 5¹³, Is 5¹⁷, 28¹⁷, ψ 51⁵, Pr 13¹⁶ (read בָּל).¹

(e) A substantial complement of the verb הָיָה is placed first in Is 18⁵ וּבָכַר נִצָּחַ יְהוָה נִצָּחַ and *a ripening grape the flower becometh*.

Rem. Of specifications compounded with a preposition those of *place* stand regularly after the verb, unless they are specially emphatic as e.g. Gn 19², 30¹⁰, 32⁵, Mi 5¹, Est 9¹²; in Gn 29²⁵ בְּרַחֵל with בְּ preterit precedes for the sake of emphasis. Cf., however, in Gn 35¹³ the order *verb—specification of place—subject*.—The remoter object precedes for the sake of emphasis, e.g. in Gn 13¹⁵ (26³), 15³; even before the interrogative, Gn 27³⁷ (cf. Jer 22¹⁵ where the subject precedes an interrogative, and 1 S 20⁸, Jb 34⁸¹ where a prepositional specification precedes).—Prepositional specifications of *time*, such as בְּרֵאשִׁית (Gn 1¹), בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, &c. (but not בְּרֵאשִׁיתָהּ, nor the simple רֵאשִׁיתָהּ, בְּתַחֲלָה, לְעוֹלָם), stand, as a rule, before the verb, provided it be not in the perf. consec. or imperf. consec.; so also certain adverbs of time, such as אָז, עַתָּה, whilst others like עוֹד, תָּמִיד regularly follow the verb.

§ 143. The Compound Sentence.

A compound sentence (§ 140 d) is formed by the juxtaposition of *a* a subject² (which always precedes, see c) and

(a) An independent noun-clause, which (α) refers to the principal subject by means of a pronoun, e.g. Na 1³ יְהוָה בְּסוּפָהּ יֵרָכֵב *the Lord—in the storm is his way*; 2 S 23⁶, ψ 18³¹, 104¹⁷, 125², Ec 2¹⁴; cf. also Gn 34²³, where the predicate is an interrogative clause.—A personal pronoun is somewhat frequently used as the principal subject, e.g. Is 59²¹ וְאֲנִי זֶאת בְּרִיתִי אִתָּם *and as for me, this is my covenant with them*, &c.; Gn 9⁹, 17⁴, Is 1⁷, 1 Ch 28²;³ with an interrogative noun-clause, Gn 37³⁰, Jb 21⁴, 38¹⁹:—or (β) is without a retrospective suffix (in which case naturally the connexion between the subject and predicate is much looser), e.g. 1 S 20²³ *and as touching the matter which, &c. . . behold the Lord is between thee and me for ever*; Pr 27².

Gesenius, *Comm. on Is* 42²⁴, and Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 84. 1 b. The pure Aramaic usage of placing the *object* before the *infinitive* occurs in Hebrew in Lv 19⁹, 21²¹, Dt 28⁵⁶, 2 S 11¹⁹, Is 49⁶, 2 Ch 28¹⁰, 31⁷, 36¹⁹ (?).

¹ This sequence occurs more frequently in noun-clauses with a participial predicate, e.g. Gn 37¹⁶, 41⁹, 2 S 13⁴, &c., in interrogative sentences, e.g. 2 K 6²², Jer 7¹⁹; in all which cases the emphasized object is placed before the natural sequence of *subject—predicate*. [Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 208.]

² In Gn 31⁴⁰ a verbal-clause (הָיִיתִי *I was*) occurs instead of the subject, and is then explained by another verbal-clause.

³ In 1 Chr 28² (cf. also 27 עִם־לִבִּי *in my mind*) אֲנִי הָיָה עִם־לִבִּי might also be taken as strengthening the pronominal suffix which follows (equivalent to *I myself had it in my mind*), as e.g. Ez 33¹⁷ *whereas their own way is not equal*; cf. § 135 f.

b (b) An independent verbal-clause: (α) with a retrospective suffix,¹ e.g. Gn 9⁶ (cf. § 116 w); 17¹⁵ *as for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai*; 26¹⁵, 28¹³, 34⁸, Ex 30³⁷, 32¹, 1 S 2¹⁰, 2 K 10²⁹, Is 9¹, 11¹⁰, Ez 33², Ho 9¹¹, ψ 11⁴, 46⁵, 65⁴, 74¹⁷, Dn 1¹⁷; with a pronoun as the principal subject, Gn 24²⁷; (β) without a retrospective suffix, Is 19¹⁷ *every one that mentions it (Judah) to it (Egypt), it (Egypt) is afraid*.

c Rem. 1. In all the above examples prominence is given to the principal subject (by its mere separation from the context by means of a greater disjunctive, as a *casus pendens*²) in a manner which would be quite impossible in a simple noun or verbal-clause (e.g. Na 1⁸ if it were יְהוָה בְּמִצְפָּה; cf. the French *c'est moi qu'on a accusé*. But the statement or question contained in the clause which forms the predicate also receives greater weight. For the same purpose other members of the sentence also are sometimes placed at the beginning and resumed again by a following suffix; thus the object, Gn 13¹⁵, 21¹³, 35¹², 47²¹ (with the Samaritan and LXX read perhaps הָעֵבֶיר); 1 S 25²⁹; a specification of place, Gn 2¹⁷, 2 K 22¹⁸, &c.; a substantive with ל, 1 S 9²⁰, 2 S 6²³; cf. the examples in § 135 a.—In Nu 15²⁹ a dative is co-ordinated with the *casus pendens*, i.e. there is a transition to a different construction.

d 2. To compound sentences belong also the numerous examples already treated in the account of the tenses, where the predicate of a *casus pendens* is introduced by the *wāw apodosis*. The isolation and prominence of the principal subject is in this case still more marked than in the instances treated above; on the *casus pendens* with a following imperfect consecutive (e.g. Jer 6¹⁹, 33²⁴), cf. § 111 h; with a following perfect consecutive (e.g. Ex 4²¹, 12⁴⁴, Nu 23³, 1 S 25²⁷, 2 S 14¹⁰, Is 9⁴, 56^{6f.}), § 112 t and mm; on the participle as *casus pendens*, § 112 oo and § 116 w.—In Jb 15¹⁷ *wāw apodosis* follows with the cohortative; in Jb 23¹², ψ 115⁷, the imperfect is separated by אֲלֹ from the *wāw apodosis*; in Jb 4⁶ as for thy hope, it is the integrity of thy ways, 36²⁶, Ec 5⁶, an incomplete noun-clause is appended by *wāw apodosis*. On *wāw apodosis* after disconnected specifications of time, cf. § 112 oo at the end, and Gn 40⁹, 2 S 15³⁴ וְעַתָּה וְאֲנִי עֲבָדְךָ and now (so far as the present is concerned) I will be thy servant, Nu 12¹², Jer 4¹ (me thou needest not fear).

e 3. Sometimes a substantive introduced by ל (in respect to; cf. § 119 u) serves the same purpose as the *casus pendens* beginning the sentence, as Nu 18¹⁸ (unless the ל here serves to introduce the object, according to § 117 n); Is 32¹ (where, however, וְשָׁרִים should most probably be read); Ec 9⁴, 1 Ch 7¹, 24^{20ff.}, 2 Ch 7²¹. On the other hand, ψ 16³, 17⁴, 32⁶, 80¹⁹, 119⁹¹, are very doubtful. The suggestion of P. Haupt (*Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xiii. no. 114; Baltimore, 1894) also deserves attention, that in passages like Ec 9⁴, and in לְכָל Gn 9¹⁰, 23¹⁰, Ex 27^{3,19}, Ez 44⁹, &c., ל is not the preposition, but an emphasizing particle, answering to the Arab. *lā*, surely; Assyrian *lū*; with לְכָל it is equivalent to *in short*. Cf. also ל—לֵי sive—sive, et—et, Jos 17¹⁶, Ezr 1¹¹, Assyrian *lū*—*lū*.

¹ Cf. the Mēša' inscription, l. 31, and Horonain, therein dwelt, &c.

² But this term must not (any more than that formerly used 'the subject preceding absolutely') be misunderstood to mean that the principal subject is, as it were, floating in the air, and that the whole sentence results in an anacoluthon. On the contrary, to the Semitic mind, such sentences appear quite as correctly formed as ordinary noun- and verbal-clauses.

§ 144. *Peculiarities in the Representation of the Subject*
(especially in the Verbal-clause).

1. According to § 40 ff. most forms of the finite verb include a *a* specification of the subject in the form of *personal affirmatives* (in the imperfect also in the form of *preformatives*). Not infrequently, however, masculine forms are used in referring to feminines, e.g. *וַיֵּדַעְתֶּם* Ez 23⁴⁹; *עָשִׂיתֶם* Ru 1⁸; in the imperfect, Jo 2²², Ct 2⁷; in the imperative, Am 4¹, Zc 13⁷ (for other examples, see § 110 *k*). On emphasizing the pronominal subject by the addition of the separate pronoun, see § 135 *a* and *b*.

On the masculine as *prior gender*, cf. § 122 *g*; on similar anomalies in the use of the personal pronoun, § 135 *o*, in the connexion between substantive and adjective, § 132 *d*, between subject and predicate, § 145 *p*, *t*, *u*.

2. The third person singular is often used impersonally, especially *b* in the masculine, e.g. *וַיָּהִי* and *it came to pass*, *וְהָיָה* and *it shall come to pass*; *הָרָה* followed by *לוֹ*, &c., *it became hot to him*, i.e. *he became angry*, Gn 4⁶, &c.; *וַיֵּצֵר לוֹ* lit. *and it became strait to him*, *he was distressed*, Gn 32⁸;¹ also in the feminine, e.g. 1 S 30⁶ (*Ju* 10⁹) *וַתֵּצֵר לוֹ*; *Ju* 11³⁹, *Jer* 7³¹, *Ez* 12²⁵, *Jb* 15³² (unless *תְּמִינָתוֹ* in verse 31 be the subject); cf. also the impersonal passives, *Is* 1⁶ (*וַיִּכָּבֶה*), 29⁶ (*תִּתְּשָׁקֵר*). Somewhat different are the instances in which the 3rd singular feminine occurs as the predicate of a feminine subject which is not mentioned, but is before the mind of the speaker, e.g. *Is* 7⁷, 14²⁴, *Jer* 10⁷, *Jb* 4⁵, 18¹⁵ (in 2 K 24⁷ *כָּל-אִשָּׁר* is used in this way with a feminine predicate, and in *Jer* 19⁵ *אִשָּׁר* alone); different, too, are the instances in which the 3rd singular masculine refers to an act just mentioned, e.g. Gn 17¹¹ *וְהָיָה* and *this* (the circumcision) *shall be a token of a covenant*, &c.

Rem. The expressions for natural phenomena may be either in the 3rd *c* sing. masculine or feminine, e.g. *אֵנֹר* *it becomes light*, 1 S 20¹⁰ (but with an explicit subject, Gn 44⁹); *וַיֵּאֵר* and *it became light*; so also *יִהְיֶה* *it grows dark*, *Jer* 13¹⁶; but *וַיִּשְׁכַּח* *Mi* 3⁶; *תֵּעָפָה* *though there be darkness*, *Jb* 11¹⁷; *תִּמְטֵר* *it rains*, Am 4⁷ (where, however, the context requires the reading *אִמְטֵר*); *ψ* 50³ *נִשְׁעָרָה* *it is tempestuous*.

¹ In Arabic and Ethiopic the masculine is commonly used in this case, in Syriac the feminine.—The forms *חם* *hot*, *טוב* *good, well*, *מר* *bitter*, *צר* *narrow*, *רע* *evil* (frequently joined by *לִי*, *לוֹ*, &c.), which many regard as impersonal, are no doubt to be regarded in most cases not as forms of the 3rd pers. sing. perf., but, with Hupfeld on *ψ* 18⁷, as adjectives.

d 3. The indefinite personal subject (our *they*, *one*, the French *on*, and the German *man*¹) is expressed—

(a) By the 3rd person singular masculine, e. g. קָרָא *one* (sc. any *one* who named it, see the Rem.) called (or calls) it, Gn 11⁹, 16¹⁴, 19²², Ex 15²³; וַיִּקְרָא Gn 35^{8,10}, 2 S 2¹⁶, Is 9⁵; וַיֹּאמֶר *one* said, Gn 48¹, 1 S 16⁴; ² other examples are Gn 38²⁸ *one* put out a hand; Nu 23²¹, 1 K 22²⁸, Is 6¹⁰ לֹא וַיִּרְפָּא *and one* heals them; 8⁴ (וַיִּשָּׂא); 46⁷ (וַיִּצְעַק); Am 6¹², Mi 2⁴, Jb 27²³; by the 3rd singular feminine (וַיִּלְרֶה) Nu 26⁵⁹.

e Rem. The Jewish commentators, following the Arab grammarians, usually explain these singulars by the addition of the participle (generally determinate) of the same stem, e. g. קָרָא הִקְרָא. This view is supported by the fact that such a complement sometimes occurs, e. g. Is 16¹⁰ יִרְרֶה הַדֶּרֶךְ *the treader treads out*, for *one treads out*; 28^{4,24} (doth *one* plow continually?); Dt 17⁶ (Ez 18³²), Dt 22⁸, 2 S 17⁹ (Ez 33⁴), Jer 9²³; with an indeterminate participle (as in Arabic, e. g. *qāla qā'ilun, a sayer says*, i. e. *some one* says), e. g. Nu 6⁹, Am 9¹; cf. above, § 116 *t*, and, on the whole question, Driver on 1 S 16⁴.

f (b) Very frequently by the 3rd plural masculine, e. g. Gn 29² *for out of that well* יִשְׁקוּ *they* (i. e. people generally) watered the flocks; 26¹⁸, 35⁵, 41¹⁴, 49²¹, 1 K 1², Is 38¹⁶, Ho 12⁹, Jb 18¹⁸, 34²⁰, Est 2², Neh 2⁷.

g Rem. The 3rd plur. also is sometimes used to express an indefinite subject, where the context does not admit of a human agent or at least not of several, e. g. Gn 34²⁷. In such a case the 3rd plur. comes to be equivalent to a passive, as very commonly in Aramaic (see Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 96. 1 c); e. g. Jb 7³ wearisome nights מְנוּרָלִי have they allotted to me (equivalent to *were allotted to me*; to make 'invisible powers' the subject is a merely artificial device); Jb 4¹⁹, 6², 18¹⁸, 19²⁶, 34²⁰, Ez 32²⁵, ψ 63¹¹, Pr 2²² (in parallelism with a passive); 9¹¹.

h (c) By the 2nd singular masculine, e. g. Is 7²⁵ לֹא-תָבוֹא שָׁמָּה *one* will (or can) not come thither (prop. *thou wilt* . . .); Jer 23³⁷, Pr 19²⁵, 30²⁸ (unless the reading should be תִּתְפַּשׁ). Cf. also עַד-בֹּאֶךָ or simply בֹּאֶךָ (Gn 10^{19,30}, 13¹⁰ בֹּאֶכָה prop. *until thy coming*, i. e. *until one comes*).

i (d) By the plural of the participle, e. g. Jer 38²³ *and all thy wives and thy children* מוֹצִיִּים (prop. *are they bringing out* =) *they will bring out*, &c.; cf. Is 32¹², Ez 13⁷, Neh 6¹⁰ (*for some are coming to slay thee*)

¹ In 1 S 9⁹ הָאִישׁ (prop. *the man*) is used in exactly the same sense as our *one*.

² Elsewhere in such cases וַיֹּאמֶר usually occurs (but not in the perfect, e. g. 1 S 23²²), so that it is doubtful whether the present reading of Gn 48¹, &c., would not be better explained according to § 7 *d*, note. In Gn 48² for the extraordinary וַיִּנָּד the common form וַיִּנְד is to be read; so in 50²⁶ for וַיִּשָּׂם (after a plural) either וַיִּשֶׂם or the 3rd plur.; in 2 K 21²³ וַיִּקְבְּרוּ.

and the passages discussed above, § 116 t.¹ In 1 K 5¹ the text is corrupt.

(e) By the passive, e. g. Gn 4²⁶ וְהָיָה לְקָרָא *then (was it begun=) k began men to call upon*, &c. (but read וְהָיָה *he began*).

4. A peculiar idiom, and one always confined to poetic language, *l* is the not infrequent occurrence of two subjects in a verbal sentence,² one of the person and the other of the thing. The latter then serves—whether it precedes or follows—to state the instrument, organ, or member by which the action in question is performed, and may be most often rendered in English by an adverb, as a nearer definition of the manner of the action. All the examples of this kind have this in common, that the subject denoting the thing takes a suffix in the same person as the personal subject.³ They are thus distinguished from the *accusatives* treated in § 117 s, with which they are often confused.

(a) Examples where the subject denoting the *thing* precedes, קוֹלִי אֶל־יְהוָה *m* אֶקְרָא *my voice—I cry unto the Lord*, i. e. *I cry aloud unto the Lord*, ψ 3⁵, 27⁷, 142²; פִּי־קָרָאתִי *my mouth—I cried*, i. e. *I cried aloud*, ψ 66¹⁷ (cf. 17¹⁰); Is 26⁹ נַפְשִׁי with *my soul*, i. e. *fervently*, and parallel with it אֶפְרֹחֵי; but נַפְשִׁי ψ 57⁵ is rather a periphrasis for the 1st pers. *I*.

(b) Where the subject denoting the *thing* follows, צִהֲלִי קוֹלֶךָ *cry—thy voice* (i. e. *aloud*), Is 10³⁰; so also after an imperative, ψ 17¹³ (חַרְפֵּךְ) and verse 14 (יִרְךָ); 60⁷, 108⁷ (יִמְיִנֶךָ); after a perfect, Hb 3¹⁵ (סִנְיֶיךָ); after a cohortative, ψ 108² (אֶפְרֹחֶיךָ). The subject denoting the *thing* stands between the personal subject and the predicate in ψ 44³ יִרְךָ אֶתָּה.⁴

Rem. 1. Sometimes (as in other languages) an action is ascribed to a *n* subject which can only have been performed at his direction by another

¹ That this form of expression also (see *g*) comes to be equivalent to a passive is seen from the analogy of such Aramaic passages as Dn 4²², which exclude any idea of human agency. Cf. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 76. 2 e at the end, and in post.-bibl. Hebrew, e. g. *Pirqe Aboth* 2, 16; 3, 5, &c.

² Two subjects occur in a noun-clause in ψ 83¹⁹.

³ In Ex 6³ שְׁמִי is subordinated to the following passive נִדְעָתִי (§ 121 b); in 1 S 25^{26.33} יָדִי, רֶגְלֶיךָ are subjects to the infinitive absolute הוֹשִׁיעַ, according to § 113 gg. In ψ 69¹¹ read וְאֶבְרָכָה for וְאֶעֱבֹדָה.

⁴ In several of the above examples it might naturally be supposed that the subject denoting the thing (especially when it follows the verb) is to be explained rather as a *casus instrumentalis*, i. e. as an accusative, analogous to the adverbial accusatives in § 118 g. But although it is true that the subject denoting the thing often defines more closely the manner in which the action is performed, and although in similar (but still different) examples, ψ 89², 109³⁰, Jb 19¹⁶, פִּי occurs with בְּ instrumentale, the explanation given above must nevertheless be accepted.

person; cf. e.g. Gn 40²² (41¹³), 41¹⁴, 43³⁴ (and he commanded to set before them, &c.); 46²⁹, 2 S 12⁹.

- o 2. Supposed ellipses of a definite subject are due either to a misunderstanding of the passage, or to a corruption of the text. Thus in 1 S 24¹¹ after וַתִּחַם either עֵינִי has dropped out (through confusion with עֵלְיָךְ) or we should read with the LXX וַתִּחַם. In 2 S 13³⁹ (וַתִּכַּל דָּוִד) the text is obviously corrupt.

- p 3. In poetic (or prophetic) language¹ there sometimes occurs (supposing the text to be correct) a more or less abrupt transition from one person to another. Thus from the 2nd to the 3rd (i.e. from an address to a statement), Gn 49⁴ (?), Is 31⁶ (?), 42²⁰, 52¹⁴, 61⁷, Mal 2¹⁵ (where, however, for יִכְנֹר we should undoubtedly read וַתִּכְנֹר); ψ 22⁹ [and regularly after a vocative, Is 22¹⁶, 47⁸, 48¹, 54^{1,11}, Jer 22¹⁶, 49^{4,16}, Am 5^{6f.}, Mic 1² (= 1 K 22²⁸), Mal 3⁹, 2 K 9³¹; and after הוּא Is 5⁸, 29¹⁵, Jer 22¹³]. From the 3rd to the 2nd pers., Dt 32¹⁵, Is 1²⁹ (but read probably הַמְדִּיתֶם for הַמְדִּיתֶם, which has caused the insertion of אֲשֶׁר, 5⁸, Jer 29¹⁹, Jb 16⁷, cf. also Dt 32¹⁷). From the 1st to the 3rd pers., La 3¹ (in a relative clause). In Jb 13²⁸ the 3rd pers. וְהוּא is probably employed *δεικτικῶς* for the 1st.

§ 145. Agreement between the Members of a Sentence, especially between Subject and Predicate, in respect of Gender and Number.

- a 1. As in other languages, so also in Hebrew, the predicate in general conforms to the subject in gender and number (even when it is a pronoun, e.g. וְאֵת בְּרִיתִי *this is my covenant*, Gn 17¹⁰). There are, however, numerous exceptions to this fundamental rule. These are due partly to the *constructio ad sensum* (where attention is paid to the meaning rather than to the grammatical form; see b-l below), partly to the position of the predicate (regarded as being without gender) before the subject.
- b 2. Singular nouns which include in themselves a collective idea (§ 123 a), or which occasionally have a collective sense (§ 123 b), may readily, in accordance with their meaning, be construed with the plural of the predicate, whether it precedes or follows. This is also the case, when the collective is itself feminine but represents, exclusively or at least generally, masculine persons.

Examples:—

- c (a) Of collectives proper (cf. § 132 g): (a) with the predicate preceding, Gn 30³⁸ הַצֹּאן קָבָאן (cf. 30³⁹, 31⁸ and 33¹³); Ju 1^{22f.} בָּיִת representing persons belonging to the tribe; Mi 4³ גִּבּוֹי 2 K 25⁵ חֵיל *army*; Pr 11²⁶ לְאֻם

¹ In prose, Lv 2⁸; but וְהִקְרִיבָה here is hardly the original reading. Different from this is Gn 26⁷, where there is a transition to direct narration.

the people; Nu 10³ בְּלִיְהֵעֲדָה all the congregation (cf. 1 K 8⁵); 1 K 1⁴⁰, Is 9⁸, 25³, Am 1⁵ עַם; 1 S 17⁴⁷, Ezr 10¹² קָהָל assembly. Cf. also the construction of national names, as אֲרָם (§ 122 i), e.g. 1 K 20²⁰ וַיָּנֹסוּ אֲרָם and the Syrians fled; 1 S 4⁵—(β) with the predicate following, 1 K 8⁵ צֹאן וּבָקָר sheep and oxen, construed with the plural in the following relative clause; Jb 1¹⁴ הַבָּקָר הָיוּ הָרִשּׁוֹת the cattle (cows) were ploughing; 2 S 3¹ and 1 Ch 10⁶ בָּיִת = family (in 1 S 6¹³ בֵּית שֹׁמֶשׁ on the analogy of names of countries, is used for the inhabitants of Bethshemesh); Ho 11⁷, Ezr 4⁴ עַם; ψ 68¹¹ חֵיהָ herd [if correct, figuratively for people]; Is 26¹⁹ גְּבֻלָּה dead bodies; Is 27¹¹ קִצִּיר boughs; 1 S 4¹ וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל, preceded by a predicate in the singular.

(b) Of substantives occasionally used as collectives: (α) with the predicate *d* preceding, Gn 34²⁴ וְכָר; Ju 9⁵⁶, 15¹⁰ אִישׁ; Is 16⁴ רֶמֶס the treader down.—(β) with the predicate following, Jb 8¹⁹ אֲחֵר = others; Ez 28³ סֵתוּם a secret; [ψ 9⁷, and even after זֶה Jb 19¹⁹.]

(c) Of feminines as collective terms denoting masculine persons: (α) with *e* the predicate preceding, 1 S 17⁴⁶ יִדְעוּ בְּלִיְהָאָרֶץ that all the earth may know, i.e. all the inhabitants of the earth; cf. Dt 9²⁸, ψ 66¹, 96^{1,9}, &c.; Am 1⁸ שְׁאֵרִית remnant; (ψ 33⁸ בְּלִיְהָאָרֶץ).—(β) with the predicate following, Gn 41⁵⁷, 2 S 15²³, 1 K 10²⁴, Gn 48⁸ מוֹלֶדֶת issue; 1 S 2³³ בְּלִיְמִרְבִּית all the increase; Jb 30¹² פְּרָחָה rabble. In Hag 2⁷ read חֲמֶרֶת with the LXX.

Examples of predicates in the singular, notwithstanding the collective meaning of the subject, occur in Gn 35¹¹, Ex 10²⁴, 14¹⁰, Dt 1³⁹, &c.—For *f* examples of bold enallage of the number in noun-clauses with a substantival predicate, see above, § 141 c.

Rem. Not infrequently the construction begins in the singular (especially *g* when the predicate precedes; see o below), but is carried on, after the collective subject has been mentioned, in the plural; e.g. Ex 1²⁰ וַיִּרְבּוּ הָעָם וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty; 33⁴.

3. On the other hand, plurals which have a singular meaning *h* (§ 124 a) are frequently construed with the singular, especially the *pluralis excellentiae* or *maiestatis* (§ 124 g-i; on the union of these plurals with attributes, cf. § 132 h), as אֱלֹהִים Gn 1³, &c. (but see the Rem.), מַלְאָכִים master, Ex 21⁴ מַלְאָכִים master, owner, Ex 21²⁹; cf., moreover, פְּנִים with the singular, Jb 16¹⁶ K^{eth}, רַחֲמִים Pr 12¹⁰.—So feminine forms with a masculine meaning are construed with a masculine predicate, e.g. Ec 12⁹ קָהָלֶת חָכָם הִיא the preacher was wise.

Rem. The construction of אֱלֹהִים God with the plural of the predicate may *i* be explained (apart of course from such passages as 1 K 19², 20¹⁰, where the speakers are heathen, and אֱלֹהִים may, therefore, be a numerical plural) partly as an acquiescence in a polytheistic form of expression, partly from the peculiar usage of one of the early documents of the Hexateuch, called *E* by Wellhausen, &c., *B* by Dillmann; cf. his commentary on Numbers—Joshua, p. 618, and above, § 124 g, note 2. So Gn 20¹³ (but in conversation with a heathen); 31⁶³, 35⁷, cf. also Jos 24¹⁹. That this construction was afterwards studiously avoided from fear of misconception, is shown by such passages as Neh 9¹⁸ compared with Ex 32^{4,8}, and 1 Ch 17²¹ compared with 2 S 7²³. Cf. Strack's excursus on Gen 20¹³ in *Die Genesis*, Munich, 1905, p. 77.

k 4. Plurals of names of animals or things, and of abstracts, whether they be masculine or feminine, are frequently construed with the feminine singular of the verbal predicate¹ (on the collective sense of the feminine form, cf. § 122 *s*); thus Jo 1²⁰ שָׂרָה הַעֵרֶג בְּהֵמוֹת הַשָּׂדֶה *the beasts of the field long*; Jer 12⁴ (where the predicate precedes), cf. also Jb 12⁷; names of things with the predicate preceding occur in 2 S 24¹³, Is 34¹³, Jer 4¹⁴, 51²⁹, ψ 18³⁵, 37³¹, 73² *Keth.*, 103⁵ (unless הַמַּחֲדִּישׁ is to be read for הַתַּחֲדִּישׁ), Jb 14¹⁹, 27²⁰; with the predicate following, Gn 49²² (בָּנוֹת = *branches*); Dt 21⁷, 1 S 4¹⁵ (וַעֲיִנֵּי קָמָה),² 2 S 10⁹, Is 59¹², Jer 2¹⁵ *Keth.*, 48⁴¹, 49²⁴, Pr 15²³, 20¹⁸, Jb 41¹⁰.³

l 5. Moreover, the plural of persons (especially in the participle) is sometimes construed with the singular of the predicate, when instead of the whole class of individuals, each severally is to be represented as affected by the statement. Undoubted examples of this *distributive* singular are Gn 27²⁹ (Nu 24⁹) אֲרָר וּבֵרַכְתִּיךָ כָּרוֹךְ בְּרוּךְ *those that curse thee, cursed be every one of them, and those that bless thee, blessed be every one of them*; Ex 31¹⁴, Lv 17¹⁴ and 19⁸ (in both places the Samaritan has אֲכָלִי); Is 3¹² unless נִשְׁיִי is to be regarded as a *pluralis maiestatis* according to § 124 *k*; Pr 3^{18,35} (פַּ), 18²¹ (פַּ), 21^{27b}, 27¹⁶, 28^{1b}, 28¹⁶ *Keth.*

m Rem. Analogous to the examples above mentioned is the somewhat frequent⁴ use of suffixes in the singular (distributively) referring to plurals; cf. the *verbal*-suffixes in Dt 21¹⁰, 28⁴⁸, Am 6¹⁰; and the *noun*-suffixes in Is 28, 30²², Jer 31¹⁴, Ho 4⁸ (but since ו follows, נַפְשׁוֹ is undoubtedly a dittography for נַפְשֵׁי), Zc 14¹², ψ 5¹⁰ (where, however, בְּיָמִי is clearly to be read with all the early versions); 62⁵, 141¹⁰ (?), Jb 38³², Ec 10¹⁵ [but לXX הַבְּסִיל]; finally, the suffixes with prepositions in Is 2²⁰ אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ-לֹו *which they made each one for himself* (according to others, *which they (the makers) made for him*); 5²⁶, 8²⁰, Jb 24⁵, in each case לֹו; in Gn 2¹⁹ לֹו refers to the collectives חֵיה and עֹוָה; cf. further, Jos 24⁷, Is 5²³ מַפְנֵנִי אַחֲרֵי צַדִּיקִים (but read probably צַדִּיק with the LXX, &c.). Conversely in Mi 1¹¹ לָכֶם עֲבַרְתִּי [cf. Jer 13²⁰ *Keth.*], but the text is undoubtedly corrupt.

¹ Cf. in Greek the construction of the neuter plural with the singular of the predicate τὰ πρόβατα βαίνει; in Attic Greek the plural of the predicate is allowed only when the neuter denotes actual persons, as τὰ ἀνδράποδα ἔλαβον. In Arabic also the *pluralis inhumanus* (i. e. not denoting persons) is regularly construed with the feminine singular of the attribute or predicate, as are all the *plurales fracti* (properly collective forms).

² On the possibility of explaining forms like קָמָה as 3rd plural feminine, cf. above, § 44 *m*; but this explanation would not apply to all the cases under this head, cf. Jo 1²⁰, ψ 37³¹, 103⁵.

³ In Pr 14¹ an abstract plural הַחֲכָמוֹת (to be read thus with g¹, &c., instead of חַכְמוֹת) is construed with the singular; but cf. § 86 *l*, § 124 *e*, end.

⁴ In several of the above examples the text is doubtful, and hence Mayer Lambert (*REJ.* xxiv. 110) rejects the theory of distributive singulars generally. [Cf. Driver, *Jeremiah*, p. 362, on 16⁷.]

6. Subjects in the dual are construed with the plural of the predicate, *n* since verbs, adjectives, and pronouns, according to § 88 *a*, have no dual forms; thus וְעֵינֵי לֵאָה רַבּוֹת Gn 29¹⁷ and *Leah's eyes were dull*; 2 S 24³, Is 30²⁰, Jer 14⁶, Mi 7¹⁰, ψ 18²⁸, 38¹¹ (on the other hand, in 1 S 4¹⁵ the predicate is in the feminine singular *after* the subject, and in Mi 4¹¹ *before* it; on both constructions cf. *k* above); so also אָזְנוֹת ears, 2 Ch 6⁴⁰; יָדַיִם hands, Is 1¹⁵, Jb 10⁸, 20¹⁰ (in Ex 17¹² even with the plural masculine בְּבָרִים; cf. *p*); שְׂפָתַיִם lips, 1 S 1¹³, Jb 27⁴; שְׁדָיִם breasts, Ho 9¹⁴.

7. Variations from the fundamental rule (see above, *a*) very frequently occur *when the predicate precedes the subject* (denoting animals or things¹). The speaker or writer begins with the most simple form of the predicate, the uninflected 3rd singular masculine, and leaves us without indication as to which of the following subjects (and so which gender or number) is to define the predicate thus left temporarily indefinite.² Thus inflexions are omitted in—

(*a*) The verb, with a following singular feminine, Is 2¹⁷ וְשָׁחַ נְבָהוּת and *bowed down shall be the loftiness of man*; 9¹⁸, 14¹¹, 28¹⁸, 47¹¹; 1 S 25²⁷ (see note 1 below); 1 K 8^{31b}, 22³⁶, 2 K 3²⁶, Jer 51⁴⁶, Ec 7⁷; with a following plural masc., Is 13²² וְעָנָה אֵימִים and *there shall cry wolves, &c.*; Ju 13¹⁷ *Keth.*, 20⁴⁶, 1 S 1², 4¹⁰, 2 S 24¹⁵, 1 K 13³³, Jer 51⁴⁸, ψ 124⁵, Est 9²³ (see note 1 below); Gn 1¹⁴ יְהִי מְאֹרֶת let *there be lights*; with a following plural feminine, Dt 32³⁵, 1 K 11^{3a}, Is 8⁸, Jer 13¹⁸, Mi 2⁶, ψ 57²; before collectives and mixed subjects, e. g. Gn 12¹⁶, 13⁵, 30⁴³, 32⁶, &c.; before a following dual, Is 44¹⁸, ψ 73⁷ (where, however, with the LXX וְעוֹנָמוּ should be read).

Rem. 1. The instances in which a preceding predicate appears in the plural masculine before a plural (or collective singular) feminine of persons (Ju 21²¹, 1 K 11^{8b}), of animals (Gn 30⁸⁹ where however צֹאן may refer specially to male animals) or of things (Lv 26³³, Jer 13¹⁶, Ho 14⁷, ψ 16⁴, Jb 3²⁴, Ct 6⁹), or before a dual (2 S 4¹, Zp 3¹⁶, 2 Ch 15⁷) are to be explained not on the analogy of the examples under *a*, but from a dislike of using the 3rd plur. fem. imperf., for this is the only form concerned in the above examples (cf., however, Na 3¹¹ תִּהְיֶי instead of תִּהְיֶי); cf. the examples of a following predicate in the 3rd plur. masc., instead of the fem., under *t* and *u*, and on an analogous phenomenon in the imperative, see § 110 *k*.

2. As in the case of verbs proper so also the verb הָיָה, when used as a *q* copula, frequently remains uninflected before the subject; cf. Gn 5^{23ff.}, 39⁵,

¹ Only rarely does an uninflected predicate precede a personal subject, as 1 S 25²⁷ (but הָיָה לֵאָה should probably be read, as in verse 35); Est 9²³ (before a plur. masc.). Such examples as Jb 42¹⁵ are to be explained according to § 121 *a*.

² In a certain sense this is analogous to the German *es kommt ein Mann, eine Frau, &c.*

Dt 21⁸ (according to the accents); 22²³, Is 18⁵ **וּבִקֵּר זִמְלָה יִהְיֶה נֶצֶחַ** and *a ripening grape the flower becometh*.

r (b) The adjective in a noun-clause, e.g. **וְיָשָׁר מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ** 119¹³⁷ *upright are thy judgements*; cf. verse 155.¹—On the other hand, **רָעָה** in **רָעָה צֹאן עֲבָדֶיךָ** *thy servants are shepherds*, Gn 47³, is either an unusual orthography or simply a misspelling for **רָעִי**.

S Rem. 1. As soon as a sentence which begins with an uninflected predicate is carried on after the mention of the subject, the gender and number of the subsequent (co-ordinate) predicates must coincide with those of the subject, e.g. Gn 14¹⁴ **וְהָיוּ יְהִי מְאֹרֶת** (see o above); Nu 9⁶, Ez 14¹; cf. also Gn 30³⁹ (see p above).

t 2. The dislike mentioned in p above, of using the feminine form (cf., further, § 144 a, with the sections of the Grammar referred to there, and below, under u), is exemplified sometimes by the fact that of several predicates only that which stands next to the feminine substantive is inflected as feminine (cf. the treatment of several attributes following a feminine substantive, § 132 d); thus in Is 14⁹ **רִנְּנָה**, and afterwards **עוֹרֵר** (but **עוֹרֵר** is better taken as an infin. abs. = *excitando*, reading **הָקִים** for **הָקֵם**); 33⁹ **אֲבֵל אֶמְלִלָּהּ** *mourneth, languisheth the land*. Cf. Jer 4³⁰, and the examples (§ 47 k) where only the first of several consecutive forms of the 2nd sing. fem. imperf. has the affirmative i, Is 57⁸, Jer 3⁵, Ez 22⁴, 23³² (**תִּהְיֶה** after **תִּשְׁתִּי**); on the converse sequence of genders in imperatives, Na 3¹⁵, cf. § 110 k.—Of a different kind are instances like Lv 2¹, 5¹, 20⁶, where **נָפֶשׁ** *person* (fem.) as the narrative continues, assumes (in agreement with the context) the sense of a masculine person.

u 3. The instances in which the gender or number of the following predicate appears to differ from that of the subject are due partly to manifest errors in the text, e.g. Gn 32⁹ read with the Samaritan **הָאֶחָד** instead of **הָאֶחָת**; **וְהָיָה** then follows correctly; 1 S 22⁰ read with Wellhausen **שָׂאֵל**, according to 12²⁸, instead of **שָׂאֵל**; 1 S 16⁴ read **וַיֹּאמְרוּ**; Ez 18²⁹ instead of **יִתְּבֶן** read the plural as in verse 25; so also Ez 20³⁸ for **יָבוֹא**,² and in Jb 6²⁰ for **בָּטַח**; in La 5¹⁰ read **נִכְמָר**, and cf. in general, § 7 d, note; 1 Ch 24³ read **יִלְדָּה**; in Jer 48¹⁵ also the text is certainly corrupt. Other instances are due to special reasons. The anomalies in Is 49¹¹, Ho 14¹, Pr 1¹⁶ (after **וְנִלְיוּ**), § 11⁴ (after **עֵינָיו**), 63⁴, Pr 5², 10^{21,32}, 18⁶, 26²³, Jb 15⁶ (all after **שִׁפְתָּיִם**), Pr 3² (after **מִצּוֹתִי**), § 102²⁸, Jb 16²² (after **שָׁנוֹת**), Dn 11⁴¹ (read **וּרְבוֹת**), and perhaps Gn 20¹⁷ are also to be explained (see p) from the dislike of the 3rd plur. fem. imperf.; moreover, in Jer 44¹⁹, Pr 26²³ the plur. masc. even of a participle occurs instead of the plur. fem.—In Gn 31⁸ **יִהְיֶה**, after a plural subject, is explained as a case of attraction to the following singular predicate.³—In Gn 4⁷ **רָבִיץ**

¹ This does not include such cases as Jb 24^{7,10}, where **עָרוֹם** is rather to be explained as an accusative denoting a state, § 118 n.

² **יָבוֹא** probably an error for **יָבֹאוּ**. The Masora on Lv 11³⁴ reckons fourteen instances of **יָבֹא**, where we should expect the plural.

³ So also the pronoun **הוּא** emphatically resuming the subject (see § 141 h) is attracted to the predicate in number in Jos 13¹⁴ **הוּא נַחֲלָתוֹ** . . . **אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה** *the offerings of the Lord . . . that is his inheritance*; in number and gender, Lv 25³³ **קֶרֶם**; Jer 10³.

is a substantival participle (*a lurker, a coucher*). In Gn 47²⁴ יֹהֵיָה remains undefined in gender (masc.), although the noun precedes for the sake of emphasis; so also in Gn 28²², Ex 12⁴⁹, 28^{7.32}, Nu 9¹⁴, 15²⁹, Jer 50⁴⁶, Ec 2⁷ (לִי הֵיָה as if the sentence began afresh, *and servants born in my house . . . there fell to my lot this possession* also). In Jb 20²⁶ לֹא-נָפַח may (unless אֵשׁ is regarded as masculine, § 122 o) be taken impersonally, *fire, without its being blown upon*.—In Is 16⁸ and Hb 3¹⁷ the predicate in the singular is explained from the collective character of שְׂרָמוֹת (see *h* above); on the other hand, the masculine form of the predicate is abnormal in ψ 87⁸, Pr 2¹⁰, 12²⁵, 29²⁵, Jb 8⁷, 36¹⁸.

§ 146. Construction of Compound Subjects.

1. When the subject is composed of a *nomen regens* (in the construct *a* state) with a following genitive, the predicate sometimes agrees in gender and number not with the *nomen regens*, but with the genitive, when this represents the principal idea of the compound subject.¹ Thus 1 S 2⁴ קִשְׁתַּת גִּבּוֹרִים חֲתִים *the bow of the mighty men is broken*, as if it were *the mighty men with their bow are broken*; Ex 26¹², Lv 13⁹, 1 K 1⁴¹ (but the text is clearly very corrupt), 17¹⁶, Is 2¹¹, 21¹⁷, Zc 8¹⁰, Jb 15²⁰, 21²¹, 29¹⁰, 32⁷ (רַב שָׁנִים equivalent to *many years*); 38²¹; with the predicate preceding, 2 S 10⁹, unless it is to be explained according to § 145 *k*.

Rem. 1. The cases in which קוֹל (*voice, sound*) with a following genitive *b* stands at the beginning of a sentence, apparently in this construction, are really of a different kind. The קוֹל is there to be taken as an exclamation, and the supposed predicate as in apposition to the genitive, e.g. Gn 4¹⁰ *the voice of thy brother's blood, which crieth* (prop. *as one crying*) . . . ! = *hark! thy brother's blood is crying, &c.*; Is 13⁴, 66⁶. In Is 52⁸ an independent verbal-clause follows the exclamation *the voice of thy watchmen!*; in Jer 10²² and Ct 2⁸ an independent noun-clause; in Is 40³ קוֹל קָרָא *the voice of one that crieth!* i.e. *hark! there is one crying* is followed immediately by direct speech; in Mi 6⁹ קוֹל *hark!* may be used disconnectedly (cf. the almost adverbial use of קוֹל in § 144 *m*) and יְהוָה be taken as the subject to יִקְרָא.

2. When the substantive כָּל (כָּל־) *entirely* is used in connexion with a *c* genitive as subject of the sentence, the predicate usually agrees in gender and number with the genitive, since כָּל is equivalent in sense to an attribute (*whole, all*) of the genitive; hence, e.g. with the predicate preceding, Gn 5⁵ וַיְהִי כָל-יְמֵי אָדָם *and all the days of Adam were, &c.* (in 5²³, 9²⁹ וַיְהִי; but the Samaritan reads וַיְהִי here also); Ex 15²⁰; with the predicate following, ψ 150⁶, &c. Exceptions are, e.g. Lv 17¹⁴ (but cf. § 145 *l*), Jos 8²⁵, Is 64¹⁰, Pr 16², Na 3⁷. On the other hand, in such cases as Ex 12¹⁶ the agreement of the

¹ Sometimes, however, the attraction of the predicate to the genitive may be merely due to juxtaposition.

predicate with **כָּל-מְלָאכָה** is explained from the stress laid upon the latter, **כָּל-מְלָאכָה** being equivalent to *the whole of work* (is forbidden).

d 2. When the subject of the sentence consists of several nouns connected by *wāw copulative*, usually

(a) The predicate *following* is put in the plural, e.g. Gn 8²² **זֶרַע וְקָצִיר וְקֹרֶם וְחֹם . . . לֹא יִשָּׁבְתוּ** *seed time and harvest, and cold and heat . . . shall not cease* (לֹא יִשָּׁבְתוּ); after subjects of different genders it is in the masculine (as the *prior gender*, cf. § 132 d), e.g. Gn 18¹¹ **אַבְרָהָם וְשָׂרָה זָקְנִים** *Abraham and Sarah were old*; Dt 28³², 1 K 1²¹.

e Rem. Rare exceptions are Pr 27⁹ **שֶׁמֶן וְקַטְרֶת יִשְׂמַח-לֵב** *ointment and perfume rejoice the heart*, where the predicate agrees in gender with the masculine **שֶׁמֶן** (as in Is 51³ with **שִׁשְׁוֹן**); on the other hand, in Ex 21⁴ (where **הָאִשָּׁה** and **וְיָלְדָהּ** are the subjects) it agrees with **הָאִשָּׁה** as being the principal person; in the compound sentence, Is 9⁴, it agrees with the feminine subject immediately preceding.¹

f (b) The predicate *preceding* two or more subjects may likewise be used in the plural (Gn 40¹, Jb 3⁵, &c.); not infrequently, however, it agrees in gender and number with the first, as being the subject nearest to it. Thus the predicate is put in the singular masculine before several masculines singular in Gn 9²³, 11²⁹, 21³², 24⁵⁰, 34²⁰, Ju 14⁵; before a masculine and a feminine singular, e.g. Gn 3⁸, 24⁵⁵ *then said (וַיֹּאמֶר) her brother and her mother*; 33⁷; before a masculine singular and a plural, e.g. Gn 7⁷ **וַיָּבֹא נֹחַ וּבָנָיו** *and Noah went in, and his sons, &c.*; Gn 8¹⁸ (where feminines plural also follow); 44¹⁴, Ex 15¹, 2 S 5²¹; before collectives feminine and masculine, 2 S 12².

g Similarly, the feminine singular occurs before several feminines singular, e.g. Gn 31¹⁴ **וַתֵּעַן רָחֵל וְלֵאָה** *then answered Rachel and Leah*; before a feminine singular and a feminine plural, e.g. Gn 24⁶¹; before a feminine singular and a masculine singular, Nu 12¹ **וַתִּדְבֹר מִרְיָם וְאַהֲרֹן** *then spake Miriam and Aaron*; Ju 5¹; before a feminine singular and a masculine plural, e.g. Gn 33⁷ (cf., on the other hand, ψ 75⁴ **וְכָל-יֹשְׁבֵיָהּ** *dissolved are the earth and all the inhabitants thereof*). The plural feminine occurs before a plural feminine and a plural masculine in Am 8¹³.—In Jer 44²⁵ for **אֲתֵם וְנִשְׁיֵכֶם** read **אֲתֵם** *אֲתֵם* with the LXX, and cf. verse 19.

h (c) When other predicates follow after the subjects have been mentioned, they are necessarily put in the plural; cf. Gn 21³², 24⁶¹, 31¹⁴, 33⁷, &c., and § 145 s.

¹ Similarly with a mixed object, Gn 33² *he put . . . Leah and her children after*; **אַחֲרֵיהֶם** agrees with the masculine immediately preceding.

§ 147. *Incomplete Sentences.*

1. Sentences are called *incomplete*, in which either the subject or *a* the predicate or both must in some way be supplied from the context.¹ Besides the instances enumerated in § 116 *s* (omission of the personal pronoun when subject of a participial clause) and the periphrases for negative attributes § 152 *u*, this description includes certain (noun-) clauses introduced by הִנֵּה (see *b* below), and also a number of exclamations of the most varied kinds (see *c* below).

Rem. Incomplete sentences are very common in Chronicles, but are mostly due to the bad condition of the text; cf. Driver, *Introd.*³, p. 537, no. 27. Thus in 2 Ch 11^{22 b} restore הָשֵׁב, with the LXX, before לְהַמְלִיכוֹ; in 35²¹ add בָּאֲתִי, with the LXX, after הַיּוֹם and read פָּרַת for בֵּית; in 2 Ch 19⁶ and 28²¹ the pronoun הוּא is wanted as subject, and in 30³ the predicate יְהִי; cf. also the unusual expressions in 1 Ch 9³³ (Ezr 3³), 1 Ch 15¹³ (*ye were not present?*), 2 Ch 15³, 16^{10.12} (^{bis}), 18³.

2. The demonstrative particle הֵן, הִנֵּה *en, ecce* may be used either *b* absolutely (as a kind of interjection, cf. § 105 *b*) before complete noun- or verbal-clauses, e.g. Gn 28¹⁵ וְהִנֵּה אֲנִי עִמָּךְ *and, behold! I am with thee*; 37⁷, 48²¹, Ex 3¹³, 34¹⁰, or may take the pronoun, which would be the natural subject of a noun-clause, in the form of a suffix, see § 100 *o*. Whether these suffixes are to be regarded as in the accusative has been shown to be doubtful in § 100 *p*. However, in the case of הִנֵּה the analogy of the corresponding Arabic demonstrative particle 'inna (followed by an accusative of the noun) is significant.² If הִנֵּה with a suffix and a following adjective or participle (see the examples in § 116 *p* and *q*) forms a noun-clause, the subject proper, to which הִנֵּה with the suffix refers, must, strictly speaking, be supplied again before the predicate.³ Sometimes, however, the pronoun referring to the subject is wanting, and the simple הִנֵּה takes the place of the

¹ This does not apply to such cases as Gn 33⁸, where an infinitive with ל appears alone in answer to a question, the substance of the question being presupposed as a main clause; cf. also Gn 26⁷, where הִיא must again be supplied after אֲשֶׁרִי.

² On the same analogy any substantive following הִנֵּה would have to be regarded as originally a virtual accusative. Since, however, Hebrew does not possess case-terminations (as the Arabic does, and uses the accusative necessarily after 'inna), it is very doubtful whether, and how far, substantives following הִנֵּה were felt to be accusatives.

³ That these are real noun-clauses and that the participle (e.g. מֵת in מֵת הִנֵּה Gn 20³) cannot be taken as a second accusative (as it were *ecce te moriturum*), is also shown by the analogy of Arabic, where after 'inna with an accusative the predicate is expressly in the *nominative*.

subject and copula (as Gn 18⁹ הִנֵּה בָּאֵהָל *behold she is in the tent*; 42²⁸), or there is no indication whatever of the predicate, so that the sentence is limited to הִנֵּה with the suffix, as in the frequent use of הִנֵּנִי, הִנֵּנִי here *am I*, in answer to an address. Elsewhere a substantive follows הִנֵּה (or הִן Gn 11⁶, Jb 31³⁵), and הִנֵּה then includes the meaning of a demonstrative pronoun and the copula, e.g. Gn 22⁷ הִנֵּה הָאֵשׁ וְהָעֵצִים *here is the fire and the wood, &c.*; 12¹⁹ *behold thou hast thy wife!* Ex 24⁸; with reference to the past, e.g. Am 7¹ וְהִנֵּה לְקִישׁ וּג' *and lo, it was the latter growth, &c.* By a very pregnant construction the simple הִנֵּה is used as the equivalent of a sentence in Jb 9¹⁹, *lo, here am I!*

- C 3. Examples of exclamations (threatening, complaining, triumphing, especially warlike or seditious) in which, owing to the excitement of the speaker, some indispensable member of the sentence is suppressed, are—(a) with suppression of the predicate (which has frequently to be supplied in the form of a jussive), e.g. Ju 7²⁰ *a sword for the Lord and for Gideon!* (verse 18 without הָיָה); 2 S 20¹ and 2 Ch 10¹⁶ (cf. also 1 K 22³⁶) *every man to his tents, O Israel!* (i. e. *let every man go to or remain in his tent*); without אֵשׁ 1 K 12¹⁶; moreover, Is 1²³, 13⁴ (on the exclamatory קול equivalent to *hark!* cf. § 146 b); 28¹⁰, 29¹⁶ (הַפְּכֵם *O your perversity!* i. e. *how great it is!*); Jer 49¹⁶ (if תִּבְלַצְתָּךְ be equivalent to *terror be upon thee!*); Jo 4¹⁴, Mal 1¹³ (הִנֵּה מִתְלַאֵחַ *behold what a weariness!*); Jb 22²⁹; perhaps also Gn 49⁴ פָּחוּ בַּפִּיִּם *a bubbling over as water* (sc. happened), unless it is better to supply a subject אַתָּה (*thou wast*).—(b) With suppression of the subject, Ju 4²⁰, cf. § 152 k; Jb 15²³ אֵיזָה *where* sc. is bread?—(c) With suppression of both subject and predicate, Ju 7¹⁸ (see above); 1 K 12¹⁶ (see above); 2 K 9²⁷ גַּם אֹתוֹ *him also!* explained immediately afterwards by הִכֵּהוּ *smite him!* Ho 5⁸ *after thee, Benjamin!* sc. is the enemy (differently in Ju 5¹⁴); ψ 6⁴, 90¹³, Hb 2⁶ עֲדֹמָתִי; ψ 74⁹ עֲדֹמָה.—On וְלֹא *and if not* (unless וְלֹא is to be read), 2 S 13²⁶, 2 K 5¹⁷, see § 159 dd.

- d Rem. 1. To the class of incomplete sentences naturally belong exclamations introduced by interjections אַחֲמָה, אֹי, הֵם, הִי; ¹ cf. § 105. After the first two the object of the *threat* or *imprecation* follows regularly with לְ (cf. *vae tibi*) or אֶל־ or עַל־, e.g. אֹי לָנוּ *woe unto us!* 1 S 4⁸, Is 6⁵; cf. also אַחֲמָה לַיּוֹם *alas for the day!* Jo 1¹³; on the other hand, the object of *commiseration* (after הֵם) follows mostly in the vocative, or rather in the accusative of exclamation (cf. *vae te* in Plautus); so in lamentation for the dead, הֵם הֵם אֹחֵי *alas, my brother!* 1 K 13³⁰,

¹ We do not consider here the cases in which these interjections (e.g. הֵם Ju 3¹⁹, Am 6⁰) stand quite disconnectedly (so always אַחֲמָה and אֹחֵי).

Jer 22¹⁸; הָאָמָה הוּאֹי גּוֹי חַטָּא *ah, sinful nation!* Is 1⁴, 5^{8.11.18.20.22} (*ah! they that . . .*).—For הָם cf. Hb 2²⁰, Zp 1⁷, Zc 2¹⁷.

2. Finally, instances of noun-clauses shortened in an unusual manner *c* may perhaps occur in יְרִיחֶם and רְגִלֵּיהֶם ψ 115⁷, for לָהֶם יָדִים *they have hands*, &c.; cf. verses 5 and 6 פָּה־לָהֶם, &c. Perhaps also וּפִלְגֶּשׁוּ Gn 22²⁴, and וְחָלִיו Ec 5¹⁶ are to be regarded in the same way, but hardly נִבְיָאֲכֶם Nu 12⁶; cf. § 128 *d* above.

II. Special Kinds of Sentences.

§ 148. Exclamations.

The originally interrogative מָה is used to introduce exclamations *a* of wonder or indignation = *O how!* or ridicule, *why! how!* sometimes strengthened by וְהָ or וְאֵת according to § 136 *c*.—Astonishment or indignation at something which has happened is introduced by אֵיךְ *how* (likewise originally interrogative) with the perfect; the indignant refusal of a demand by אֵיךְ (but also by מָה Jb 31¹) with the imperfect; an exclamation of lamentation by אֵיכָה, less frequently אֵיךְ *how!*; in Jo 1¹⁸ by מָה.

Examples:—

מָה (or מָה־ with a following *Dageš*, see § 37) expressing admiration (or *b* astonishment) before verbal-clauses, e.g. Gn 27²⁰ (מָה־נָּה); 38²⁹, Nu 24⁵ (*how goodly are . . .!*); ψ 21², Ct 7²; before the predicate of noun-clauses, e.g. Gn 28¹⁷, ψ 8²; mockingly before the verb, 2 S 6²⁰ (*how glorious was . . .!*); Jer 22²³, Jb 26²¹; indignantly, Gn 3¹³ מָה־וָאֵת; 4¹⁰, 20⁹, 31²⁶ *what hast thou done!*

אֵיךְ with the perfect, e.g. Gn 26⁹, ψ 73¹⁹; in scornful exclamation, Is 14^{4.12}; in a lament (usually אֵיכָה, 2 S 1^{25.27}; with the imperfect, in a reproachful question, Gn 39⁹, 44⁸, ψ 11¹, 137⁴; in a mocking imitation of lament, Mi 2⁴.

אֵיכָה with the perfect, Is 1²¹, La 1¹; with the imperfect, La 2¹, 4¹.

Rem. 1. The close relation between a question and an exclamation appears *c* also in the interrogative personal pronoun מִי in such cases as Mi 7¹⁸ מִי־אֵל כְּמֹדֶךָ *who is a God like unto thee?* and so in general in *rhetorical* questions as the expression of a forcible denial; similarly in the use of an interrogative sentence to express a wish, see §§ 150 *d*, 151 *a*.

2. A weaker form of exclamation is sometimes produced by the insertion *d* of a corroborative כִּי *verily, surely*, before the predicate, Gn 18²⁰; cf. 33¹¹, Is 7⁹, and the analogous cases in the apodoses of conditional sentences, § 159 *ea*.

§ 149. Sentences which express an Oath or Asseveration.

The particle אִם, in the sense of *certainly not*, and אִם־לֹא (rarely כִּי *a* Gn 22¹⁶) in the sense of *certainly*, are used to introduce promises or threats confirmed by an oath (especially after such formulae as חִי־יְהוֹנָה,

חִי-נַפְשֶׁךָ, חִי אָנִי, בִּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי, &c., as well as after imprecations, see below), and also simple asseverations, e.g. 1 S 2³⁰, 2 S 20²⁰, Jb 27⁵ after חַלִּילָה לִי *far be it from me*, but mostly without any introductory formula.

- b** Rem. No certain explanation of these particles has yet been given. According to the usual view, phrases expressing an oath depend on the suppression of an imprecation upon oneself, e.g. *the Lord do so unto me, if I do it equivalent to I certainly will not do it*; then naturally אִם-לֹא properly *if I do it not equivalent to I certainly will do it*. It is indeed difficult to understand such self-imprecations, put into the mouth of God, as in Dt 1^{34 f.}, Is 14²⁴, 22¹⁴, Jer 22⁶, Ez 3⁶, 35⁶, ψ 95¹¹. Possibly, however, the consciousness of the real meaning of the formula was lost at an early period, and אִם-לֹא simply came to express *verily*, אִם *verily not*.—In 1 S 25²², where, instead of a self-imprecation, a curse is pronounced upon others, read לְדֹר with the LXX for לְאִיבֵי דֹר.

Examples:—

- c** (a) The particles אִם and אִם-לֹא used after the utterance of an oath and after formulae of swearing, e.g. 2 S 11¹¹ (see note on a) חִי-יְהִיָּה וְחִי נַפְשֶׁךָ אִם-אֶעֱשֶׂה אֶת-הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה *as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not do this thing*; 1 S 14⁴⁵, 2 K 5¹⁶ (after חִי יְהִיָּה; in 1 S 14³⁹ and 29⁶ חִי-י is followed by a simple כִּי); Ct 2⁷, 3⁵ (after הִשְׁבַּעְתִּי *I adjure you*); cf. also Gn 14²³, 21²³, 26²⁰; spoken by God, Dt 1^{34 f.}, 1 S 3¹⁴, ψ 95¹¹; similarly אִם-לֹא Gn 24^{37 f.}; spoken by God, Is 14²⁴, where אִם-לֹא occurs first with the perfect in the sense of a prophetic perfect, § 106 *n*, but in the parallel clause with the imperfect; Jer 22⁶; in Gn 31⁵² the negative oath introduced by אִם-אָנִי, אִם-אֶתָּה is immediately afterwards continued by לֹא with the imperfect.—In Ez 34¹⁰ the threat introduced in verse 8 by אִם-לֹא is, after a long parenthesis, resumed with הֲנִי.
- d** (b) אִם and אִם-לֹא after formulae of cursing, e.g. 1 S 3¹⁷ כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה-יְקֹךְ אֱלֹהִים וְכֹה יוֹסִיף אִם-תִּכְתֹּד מִמֶּנִּי דָּבָר וְג' *God do so to thee, and more also! thou shalt not hide anything from me, &c.*; cf. 1 S 25²². On the other hand, כִּי follows the curse, in 1 S 14⁴⁴, 1 K 2²³ (here with a perfect), and in 2 S 3³⁵ אִם כִּי; in 1 S 25³⁴ the preceding כִּי is repeated before אִם; in 1 S 20¹³ the purport of the asseveration is repeated (after the insertion of a conditional sentence) in the perfect consecutive.
- e** (c) אִם and אִם-לֹא as simple particles of asseveration, e.g. Ju 5⁸ מִן אִם-יִרְאָה וְיִכָּח וְג' *truly, there was not a shield and spear seen, &c.*; Is 22¹⁴, Jb 6²⁸ (in the middle of the sentence); after חַלִּילָה חַלִּילָה *absit*, 2 S 20²⁰; אִם-לֹא with the imperf. Is 5⁹, with the perfect, Jb 22²⁰.

¹ Also combined חִי-יְהִיָּה וְחִי נַפְשֶׁךָ 1 S 20³, 25²⁶ *as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul (i.e. thou) liveth!* (Also in 2 S 11¹¹ read חִי-יְהִיָּה instead of the impossible חִיָּךְ). On חִי and חִי in these noun-clauses (prop. *living is the Lord, &c.*), cf. § 93 *aa*, note.

§ 150. Interrogative Sentences.

H. G. Mitchell, 'The omission of the interrogative particle,' in *Old Test. and Sem. Studies in memory of W. R. Harper*, Chicago, 1907, i, 113 ff.

1. A question need not necessarily be introduced by a special *a* interrogative pronoun or adverb. Frequently¹ the natural emphasis upon the words is of itself sufficient to indicate an interrogative sentence as such; cf. Gn 27²⁴ אָתָּה יְהוָה בְּנִי עֵשָׂו *thou art my son Esau?* (but cf. note 1 below) Gn 18¹², Ex 33¹⁴ (פָּנִי י'); 1 S 11¹² שָׂאוּל יִמְלֹךְ *Saul shall reign over us?* 1 S 22⁷, 2 S 16¹⁷, 18²⁹ לַפַּעַר שְׁלוֹם *is it well with the young man?* (but cf. note 1); 1 S 16⁴, 1 K 1²⁴, 1 S 28²⁸, Ho 4¹⁶, Zc 8⁶ (*should it also be marvellous in mine eyes?*); Pr 5¹⁶. So especially, when the interrogative clause is connected with a preceding sentence by וְ, e. g. Jn 4¹¹ וְאֲנִי לֹא אֶחָם *and I should not have pity?* Ex 8²² *will they not stone us?* Ju 11²³, 14¹⁶, 1 S 20⁹, 24²⁰, 25¹¹, 2 S 11¹¹, 15²⁰, 1 S 37¹¹, 44^{19b}, Jer 25²⁹, 45⁵, 49¹², Ez 20³¹, Jb 2¹⁰, 10⁹; or when (as in some of the examples just given) it is negative (with לֹא for הֲלֹא *nonne?*), 2 K 5²⁶ (but cf. note 1), La 3³³.²

Rem. The statement formerly made here that the interrogative particle is *b* omitted especially before gutturals, cannot be maintained in view of Mitchell's statistics (op. cit. p. 123 f.). The supposed considerations of euphony are quite disproved by the 118 cases in which הֲ or הִי occurs before a guttural.

2. As a rule, however, the simple question is introduced by *He c* interrogative הֲ (הִי; as to its form, cf. § 100 k-n), *ne? num?* the disjunctive question by הִי (*num? utrum?*) in the first clause, and אִם³ (also וְאִם, less frequently אִן) *an?* in the second, e. g. 1 K 22¹⁵ . . . הֲנִלְכֶּהּ

¹ Mitchell (op. cit.) restricts the number of instances to 39, of which he attributes 12 (or 17) to corruption of the text. Thus in Gn 27²⁴ he would read, with the Samaritan, אָתָּה הֲאֵתָה as in verse 21, in 1 S 16⁴ הֲשָׂאוּל, in 2 S 18²⁹ הֲשְׁלֹם as in verse 32; similarly he would read the interrogative particle in 2 K 5²⁶, Ez 11³, Jb 40²⁵, 41¹; 1 S 30⁸, 2 K 9¹⁹, Ez 11¹³, 17⁹.

² But in 1 S 27¹⁰ instead of אֶל־ (which according to the usual explanation would expect a negative answer) read either אֶל־מִי (עַל־מִי) with the LXX, or better, אֶן (אֲנִה) *whither?* with the Targum. In 2 S 23⁵ read הֲלֹא חֲפָצִי *with Wellhausen.*

³ Quite exceptional is the use of the particle אִין *num?* (common in Aramaic) in 1 S 21⁹ וְאִין יֵשׁ־כֹּה *num est hic?* The text is, however, undoubtedly corrupt; according to Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Sam.*, the LXX express the reading הֲיֵשׁ אֵתָה; but cf. the full discussion of the passage by König, ZAW. xviii. 239 ff.—The above does not apply to interrogative sentences introduced by interrogative pronouns (§ 37) or by the interrogatives compounded with מָה *what?* such as כַּמָּה *how many?* לָמָּה *why?* (see § 102 k), מָדַע *why?* (§ 99 e), or by אֵיךְ *where?* אֵיךְ *how?* (§ 148), &c. On the transformation of

אִם ¹נִהְיֶה shall we go . . . or shall we forbear? Cf. also אֵן where? whither? אָנֹכִי whither, and J. Barth, *Sprachwiss. Untersuchungen*, i. 13 ff.

d The particular uses are as follows:—

(a) The particle הֲ stands primarily before the simple question, when the questioner is wholly uncertain as to the answer to be expected, and may be used either before noun-clauses, e.g. Gn 43⁷ הֲעוֹד אֲבִיכֶם חַי הִישׁ לָכֶם אָח is your father yet alive? have ye another brother? for הִישׁ cf. Gn 24²⁸, 1 S 9¹¹; for הֲכִי is it that? Jb 6²²; for הֲכִי יֵשׁ is there yet? 2 S 9¹ (but in 2 S 23¹⁹ for הֲכִי read הֲנֹ with 1 Ch 11²⁵); for הֲאִין is there not? 1 K 22⁷, &c.; or before verbal-clauses, e.g. Jb 2³ הֲשָׁמַח לְבָבְךָ my servant Job? In other cases הֲ (= num?) is used before questions, to which, from their tone and contents, a negative answer is expected, e.g. Jb 14¹⁴ הֲיִחְיֶה shall he indeed live again? Sometimes a question is so used only as a rhetorical form instead of a negative assertion, or of a surprised or indignant refusal,² e.g. 2 S 7⁵ הֲאֵתָה תִּבְנֶה לִּי בַּיִת shalt thou build me an house? (in the parallel passage 1 Ch 17⁴ לֹא אֵתָה וג' thou shalt not, &c.); Gn 4⁹ הֲשֹׁמֵר אָחִי אֲנִי am I my brother's keeper? cf. 2 K 5⁷, and the two passages where הֲ is used before the infinitive (constr. Jb 34¹⁸, absol. Jb 40²; on both, see § 113 ee, with the note).—On the other hand, in 1 K 16³¹ for הֲנִקֵּל (וְיָדִי) read הִנֵּקֵל.

e Rem. 1. A few passages deserve special mention, in which the use of the interrogative is altogether different from our idiom, since it serves merely to express the conviction that the contents of the statement are well known to the hearer, and are unconditionally admitted by him. Thus, Gn 3¹¹ surely thou hast eaten; Gn 27³⁶ הֲכִי קָרָא prop. is it so that one names? &c., i. e. of a truth he is rightly named Jacob; Gn 29¹⁵ verily thou art my brother; Dt 11³⁰, Ju 4⁶, 1 S 22⁷ I did indeed, &c.; 26³⁷, 1 K 22⁸ ye know surely . . .; Mi 3¹, Jb 20⁴.—In 1 S 23¹⁹ (cf. ψ 54²) a surprising communication is introduced in this way (by הֲלֵא) in order to show it to be absolutely true, and in Am 9⁷ a concession is expressed by הֲלֹא I have, it is true, &c. Finally, we may include the formula of quotation הֲלֵא הֵיא כְּתוּבָה Jos 10¹³ or הֲלֵא הֵם כְּתוּבִים equivalent to surely it is, they are written (the latter in 1 K 11⁴¹, 14²⁹, and very often elsewhere in the books of Kings and Chronicles), synonymous with the simple formula of assertion הִנֵּה כְּתוּבָה 2 S 1¹⁸, and הִנֵּם כְּתוּבִים 1 K 14¹⁹, 2 K 15¹¹, 2 Ch 27⁷, 32³².

Of very frequent occurrence also are questions introduced by לָמָּה, which really contain an affirmation and are used to state the reason for a request or warning, e.g. 2 S 22² turn thee aside . . . wherefore should I smite thee to the ground? i. e. otherwise I will (or must) smite, &c.; cf. 1 S 19¹⁷, and Driver on the passage; 2 Ch 25¹⁶; also Gn 27⁴⁵, Ex 32¹² (Jo 2¹⁷, ψ 79¹⁰, 115²); Ct 1⁷, Ec 5⁵, 7¹⁷, Dn 1¹⁰.

pronouns and adverbs into interrogative words by means of a prefixed אֵי, see the Lexicon.

¹ On the use of the *imperfect* in deliberative questions, see § 107 t; on the *perfectum confidentiae* in interrogative sentences, see § 106 n.

² Analogous to this is the use of the interrogative מָה in the sense of a reproachful remonstrance instead of a prohibition, as Ct 8⁴ מָה תַעֲשֶׂירִי why should ye stir up? i. e. pray, stir not up; cf. also Jb 31¹; see above, § 148.

2. The rare cases in which a *simple* question is introduced by **אֵם** (as sometimes in Latin by *an? is it?*) are really due to the suppression of the first member of a double question; thus 1 K 1²⁷, Is 29¹⁶, Jb 6¹², 39¹³.

(b) Disjunctive questions are, as a rule, introduced by **אֵם—הֲ** (*utrum—an?*) *g* or sometimes by **אֵם!—הֲ**, e. g. Jo 1², Jb 21⁴ (even with **הֲ** repeated after **אֵם!** in a question which implies disbelief, Gn 17¹⁷). In Jb 34¹⁷, 40^{8 f.} special emphasis is given to the first member by **הֲאֵם** prop. *is it even?* The second member is introduced by **אֵם** or in 2 K 6²⁷, Jb 16³, 38²⁸, 31³⁸ (Mal 1⁸ **הֲ אֵם**), in each case before **ו**, and hence no doubt for euphonic reasons, to avoid the combination **ו אֵם**; cf. also Ju 18¹⁹, Ec 2¹⁹.

Double questions with (**אֵם! אֵם—הֲ**) need not always be mutually exclusive; *h* frequently the disjunctive form serves (especially in poetic parallelism; but cf. also e. g. Gn 37⁸) merely to repeat the same question in different words, and thus to express it more emphatically. So Jb 4¹⁷ *shall mortal man be just before God? or (אֵם) shall a man be pure before his Maker?* Jb 6^{5 f.}, 8³, 10^{4 f.}, 11^{2, 7}, 22³, Is 10¹⁵, Jer 5²⁹. The second member may, therefore, just as well be connected by a simple **ו**, e. g. Jb 13⁷, 15^{7 f.}, 38^{16 f. 22. 32. 39}; cf. also **ו אֵם** after **מָה**; Jb 21^{17 f.} after **מָה**; or even without a conjunction, Jb 8¹¹, 22⁴; after **מָה** **ו אֵם** 144³.

(c) With regard to *indirect* questions² after verbs of inquiring, doubting, examining,³ &c., simple questions of this kind take either **הֲ** *whether*, Gn 8^{8, 4} or **אֵם** Gn 15⁵, 2 K 1², Ct 7¹³; even before a noun-clause, Jer 5¹; in 1 S 20¹⁰ the indirect question is introduced by **אֵם**, i. e. probably *if perchance*. In disjunctives (*whether—or*) **אֵם—הֲ** Nu 13¹⁸ at the end (or **לֹא—אֵם—הֲ** Gn 24²¹, 27²¹, 37³², Ex 16⁴), and **הֲ—הֲ** Nu 13¹⁸, which is followed by **אֵם—הֲ**; also **אֵם—הֲ** Ec 2¹⁹. The formula **אֵם יֹדַע מִי** has an affirmative force, *who knows whether...* *not*, like the Latin *nescio an*, Est 4¹⁴.

In Jon 1^{7, 8} the relative pronouns **מִי** and **מִיֹּשֶׁר** owing to the following *h* **לְמִי** have become also interrogative, *for whose cause?*

(d) **הֲ** and **הוּא** (cf. § 136 c) immediately after the interrogative serve to *l* give vividness to the question; so also **אֵפֹא** (for which **אֵפֹא** five times in Job) *then, now*, Gn 27³³ **הוּא אֵפֹא מִיֹּשֶׁר** *who then is he?* Ju 9³⁸, Is 19¹², Jb 17¹⁵; **אֵיֵה אֵפֹא**

¹ **אֵם** occurs in Pr 27²⁴ after a negative statement; we should, however, with Dyserinck read **וְאֵין**. Not less irregular is **הֲלֵא** instead of **לֹא אֵם** in the second clause of Ju 14¹⁵, but the text can hardly be correct (cf. Moore, *Ju-ages*, New York, 1895, p. 337); in 1 S 23¹¹ the second **הֲ** introduces a fresh question which is only loosely connected with the first.—In Nu 17²⁸ and in the third clause of Jb 6¹³, **הֲאֵם** is best taken with Ewald in the sense of **הֲלֵא**, since **אֵם** from its use in oaths (see above, § 149 b) may simply mean *verily not*.

² It should here be remarked that the distinction between direct and indirect questions cannot have been recognized by the Hebrew mind to the same extent as it is in Latin or English. In Hebrew there is no difference between the two kinds of sentence, either as regards mood (as in Latin) or in tense and position of the words (as in English). Cf. also § 137 c.

³ In Gn 43⁶ the **הֲ** after **לְהִיָּדַע** is explained from the fact that the latter, according to the context, implies *to give information upon a question*.

⁴ Also in Ec 3²¹ we should read **הֲעֵלָה** and **הֲיִדְרַת** (*whether—whether*) instead of the article which is assumed by the Masora.

where then is . . . ? However, אָפּוֹ may also be placed at the end of the entire question (Ex 33¹⁶, Is 22¹; also Ho 13¹⁰, since either אָהִי is a dialectical form of אָיָה, or אָיָה should be read instead of it) or at the beginning of the question proper, after a strongly emphasized word, as in Gn 27³⁷.¹

m (e) Sometimes one interrogative governs two co-ordinate clauses, the first of which should rather be subordinated to the second, so that the interrogative word strictly speaking affects only the second; thus Is 5⁴ after מָדַע *wherefore looked I . . . and it brought forth?* i.e. *wherefore brought it forth*, while I looked, &c.; Is 50²; after הָ Nu 32⁶, Jer 8⁴, also Nu 16²² (read אִישׁ); after הָלָה Jos 22²⁰; after לָפָה Is 58³, 2 Ch 32⁴; after אֶל-כֵּי Is 40²⁵.² But הָ Jb 4² and הָלָה 4²¹ are separated from the verb to which they belong by the insertion of a conditional clause.

n 3. The affirmative answer is generally expressed, as in Latin, by repeating the emphatic word in the question (or with the second person changed to the first, Gn 24⁵⁸, 27²⁴, 29⁵, Ju 13¹¹), Gn 29⁶, 37^{32f}, 1 S 23¹¹, 26¹⁷, 1 K 21¹⁰, Jer 37¹⁷. (On וַיֵּשׁ *if it be so* in the corrected text of 2 K 10¹⁵, see § 159 *dd*.) As a negative answer the simple לֹא is sometimes sufficient, as in Gn 19², 1 K 3²², &c.; cf. § 152 c; and in Ju 4²⁰ the simple הִנֵּה equivalent to *no* or *no one*.

§ 151. Desiderative Sentences.

a A wish may be expressed not only by the simple imperfect (§ 107 n), cohortative (§ 108, especially with הִנֵּה § 108 c), jussive (§ 109; with הִנֵּה § 109 b), imperative (§ 110 a), perfect consecutive (§ 112 aa) or by a simple noun-clause (§ 116 r, note, and § 141 g) but also in the following ways:—

1. By exclamations in the form of *interrogative* clauses:³ especially sentences with מִי followed by the imperfect as being the mood of that which is still unfulfilled but possible, and hence also of that which is desired, e.g. 2 S 15⁴ מִי-יַשְׁמִנֵּי שֹׁפֵט *who maketh me judge?* i.e. *O that I were made judge!* 1 S 20¹⁰, 2 S 23¹⁵. On the other hand, מִי with the perfect (Gn 21⁷, Nu 23¹⁰, 1 S 26⁹, Is 53¹, &c.) or participle (ψ 59⁸, Pr 24²², &c.), rather expresses a rhetorical question, i.e. a denial, cf. § 150 d. Especially frequent is the use of מִי-יָתֵן (prop. *who gives?*) to introduce all kinds of desiderative clauses (see under b).—In Mal 1¹⁰ the desiderative clause proper is co-ordinated with an interrogative clause,

¹ On the other hand, in Jb 9²⁴ and 24²⁵ אָפּוֹ is not prefixed to the מִי, but appended to the conditional sentence.

² Cf. the analogous sentences after עַל *because*, Is 65¹², Jer 35¹⁷; after causal אֲשֶׁר 1 S 26²³; after כִּי Is 12¹; likewise after הֵן § 153 at the end; after פֶּן Dt 8¹²⁻¹⁴, 25³, Jos 6¹⁸, 2 S 12²⁸.

³ The transition from a question to a wish may be seen, e.g. in Nu 11⁴ *who shall give us flesh to eat?* i.e. *O that we had flesh to eat!*

וְיִסְּרוּ דְלָתֵינוּ *would that one were among you and would shut the doors*, i. e. O that one would shut the doors!

Rem. Sometimes the original sense of *מִי־יִתֵּן* is still plainly discernible, *b* e.g. Ju 9²⁹ *מִי־יִתֵּן אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה בְּיָדִי* *who gives this people into my hand?* equivalent to, O that this people were given into my hand! cf. ψ 55⁷. In these examples, however, *מִי־יִתֵּן* is still equivalent to *O had I!* and in numerous other instances the idea of *giving* has entirely disappeared, *מִי־יִתֵּן* having become stereotyped as a mere desiderative particle (*utinam*). Its construction is either—

(a) With the *accusative* (in accordance with its original meaning) of a substantive, Dt 28⁶⁷ *would that it were even! . . . morning!* Ju 9²⁹, ψ 14⁷ (53⁷), 55⁷; with an accusative and a following infinitive, Jb 11⁵; with two accusatives, Nu 11²⁹, Jer 8²⁸; with the accusative of an infinitive, Ex 16³, 2 S 19¹ *מִי־יִתֵּן* *כִּי־יָמֹת אֲנִי תַחֲתָיִךְ* *would that I had died for thee* (for *אֲנִי* cf. § 135 *f*); of a participle, Jb 31³⁵; of a personal pronoun (as a suffix), Jb 29² (with a following *כִּי*; but *מִי־יִתֵּן* Is 27⁴ and Jer 9¹ with a following accusative is not simply equivalent to *מִי־יִתֵּן* *לִי*, but is properly *who endows me with*, &c.; cf. § 117 *f*).—With a still greater weakening of the original meaning *מִי־יִתֵּן* is used with an adjective in Jb 14⁴ *could a clean thing but come out of an unclean!* i.e. *how can a clean thing come*, &c.; similarly in Jb 31³¹ *who can find one that hath not been satisfied!*

(b) With a following perfect, Jb 23³ (cf. § 120 *e*); with a perfect consecutive, *c* Dt 5²⁶ *O that they had such an heart!*

(c) With a following imperfect, Jb 6⁸, 13⁵, 14¹³; in Jb 19²³ the imperfect is *d* twice added with *Wāw* (cf. *a* above, on Mal. 1¹⁰).

On the cohortative in the apodosis to such desiderative clauses, cf. § 108 *f*.

2. The wish may also be expressed by the particles *אִם* (ψ 81⁹, 95⁷, *e* 139¹⁹, Pr 24¹¹, 1 Ch 4¹⁰; always with a following imperfect) and *לֵי* (for which in ψ 119⁵ we have *אֶחָלִי*, 2 K 5³ *אֶחָלִי*, from *אָח* *ah!* and *לֵי* = *לִי*; both with a following imperfect) *si, o si! utinam.*¹ *לֵי* is followed by the imperfect, Gn 17¹⁸, Jb 6²; by the jussive, Gn 30³⁴ (rather concessive, equivalent to *let it be so*); by the perfect, as the expression of a wish that something might have happened in past time (cf. § 106 *p*), Nu 14² *לֵי מָתוּ* *would that we had died*; 20³ and Jos. 7⁷ (both times *וְלֵי*); on the other hand, Is 48¹⁸ and 63¹⁹ (both times *לֵי*) to express a wish that something expected in the future may already have happened.—On *לֵי* with the imperative (by an anacoluthon) Gn 23¹³ cf. § 110 *e*. On the perfect after *אִם* *כִּי* Gn 40¹⁴, 2 K 5²⁰, cf. § 106 *n*, note 2.

¹ Cf. a similar transition from a conditional to a desiderative particle, in consequence of the suppression of the apodosis, in the English, *O if I had!* and the like; e.g. Nu 22²⁹ *if there were* (*לֹא יֵשׁ*) *a sword in my hand now had I surely killed thee!*

§ 152. Negative Sentences.

a 1. Besides the use of rhetorical questions (§§ 150 *d*, 151 *a*), independent sentences are made negative by the adverbs לֹא (Jb 6²¹, where instead of the *Keth.* לוֹ we must evidently read לֹא; perhaps preserved as a substantive)=the Greek οὐ, not, לֹא=μὴ (Jb 24²⁵ as a substantive), אֵין (*it is*) not; טַרְדִּים not yet, אַפְסִי not, אַפְסִי (cf. § 90 *m*) not. The forms בִּלְי, בִּלְיִ, בִּלְיִ not belong almost entirely to poetry.—With regard to לֹא and אֵין the main distinction is that verbal-clauses (rarely noun-clauses, see *e*) are regularly negated by לֹא (besides its use as negating single words¹), while אֵין is used exclusively with noun-clauses (see the examples below).

b The conjunctions וְלֹא and לֹא בְלִי that not, serve to negative dependent clauses. The particular uses of these particles are as follows:—

(*a*) לֹא (less frequently לוֹא), like οὐ, οὐκ, is used regularly for the objective, unconditional negation, and hence is usually connected with the perfect or imperfect (as indicative); on לֹא with the imperfect to express an unconditional prohibition, see § 107 *o*; on its use with the jussive, see § 109 *d*.—On לֹא for הֲלֹא *nonne*, in interrogative sentences, cf. § 150 *a*. In connexion with בִּלְי, בִּלְיִ (=any), לֹא is used to express an absolute negation, nullus, none whatever (cf. the French *ne . . . personne, ne . . . rien*), usually in the order בִּלְי . . . לֹא, e.g. Gn 3¹ הֲגֵן מִכָּל עֵץ לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִכָּל עֵץ הַגֵּן *ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden*; 9¹¹, Ex 10¹⁵, 20¹⁰, Lv 7²³, Dt 8⁹, Jer 13⁷, 32¹⁷ (כִּלְיִ . . . לֹא *nothing at all*; cf. the same statement in the form of a rhetorical question, Jer 32²⁷); Pr 12²¹, 30⁸⁰

¹ Especially in compounds, e.g. לֹא-אֱלֹהִים lit. a no-God (Germ. *Ungott*) who is indeed called a god, but is not really a god, Dt 32²¹; לֹא אֱלֹהִים verse 17, cf. Jer 5⁷, 2 Ch 13⁹; לֹא-עָם lit. a not-people (Germ. *Unvolk*), Dt 32²¹; לֹא דָבָר a nothing, Am 6¹³; לֹא עֵץ lit. not-wood, Is 10¹⁵; לֹא-אִישׁ lit. not-man, superhuman (of God), Is 31⁸; לֹא-צֶדֶק unrighteousness, Jer 22¹³, cf. Ez 22²⁹; לֹא-סִדְרִים disorder, Jb 10²²; לֹא-חֲמָם not-violence, 16¹⁷; after לֹא Jb 26^{2f}. לֹא-כֶחָל helplessness, לֹא חֲכָמָה insipientia); cf. also Is 55² לֹא לְשִׁבְעָה for what is unsatisfying; ψ 44¹³, Jb 8¹¹, 15³², 1 Ch 12³³.—In Nu 20⁵ a construct state with several genitives is negated by לֹא.—Also לֹא is used with an infinitive, Nu 35²³; with an adjective, לֹא חָכָם unwise, Dt 32⁶, Ho 13¹³; לֹא-חֲסִיד impious, ψ 43¹; לֹא-עָז and לֹא-עֲצוּם not strong, Pr 30^{25f}.; לֹא-רָכוּ unsuitably, 2 K 7⁹; לֹא-טוֹב not-good, Is 65², Ez 20²⁵, &c.; לֹא טָהוֹר not-clean, 2 Ch 30¹⁷; with a participle, e.g. Jer 2² (unsown); 6⁸, Ez 4¹⁴, 22²⁴, Zp 2¹, 3⁵; the Masora, however, requires נִחְמָה in Is 54¹¹, in 62¹² נִשְׁבְּחָה in Jer 6⁸, רַחֲמָה in Ho 1⁶, i.e. always 3rd sing. fem. perf. in pause = she was not comforted, &c., and consequently not compounds, but either relative clauses or (Is 54¹¹, Ho 1⁶, and especially 2²⁵) main clauses instead of proper names.—On the above compounds generally, cf. the dissertation mentioned in § 81 *d*, note 2; on their use in sentences expressing a state, to convey attributive ideas, see *u* below.

כָּל־מְלָאכָה לֹא-יַעֲשֶׂה *and turneth not away for any*; 2 Ch 32¹⁵; but cf. also the inverted order, Ex 12¹⁶ לֹא-יַעֲשֶׂה כָּל־מְלָאכָה *no manner of work shall be done*; 12⁴³, 15²⁶, 22²¹, Lv 16¹⁷, Jb 33¹³, Dn 11³⁷. The meaning is different when כָּל by being determinate is used in the sense of *whole*, e.g. Nu 23¹³ כָּל־לֹא תִרְאֶה *thou shalt not see them all*, but only a part.

Analogous to כָּל־לֹא is the use of לֹא־אִישׁ Gn 23⁶, &c, in verbal-clauses in the sense of *no one at all, not a single one*. On לֹא־אִין *nothing at all*, see under *p*.

Rem. 1. The examples in which לֹא is used absolutely as a negative answer, *C* equivalent to *certainly not! no!* must be regarded as extremely short verbal-clauses, e.g. Gn 19² (לֹא according to the context for קָסוֹר &c.); 23¹¹, 42¹⁰, Hag 2¹², Jb 23⁶, sometimes with a following כִּי *but*, Gn 19² (see above); Jos 5¹⁴, 1 K 3²².

2. The negation of *noun-clauses* by לֹא (as opposed to the regular negation אִין) always includes a certain emphasis, since the force of the negation falls rather upon a particular word (cf. e.g. Ez 36³²), than upon the whole clause. In 2 S 3³⁴ לֹא־אֶסְדּוּרֹת יָדֶיךָ *thy hands were not bound*, a participle is thus specially negated by לֹא; cf. ψ 74⁹, where, however, לֹא is separated from the participle by אֶתְּנֵנִי, and Jb 12³. As a rule, noun-clauses with a pronominal subject are thus negated by לֹא, Gn 20¹², Nu 35²³ (Dt 4⁴², 19⁴); 1 S 15²⁹, 2 S 21², Jer 4²², ψ 22⁷, Jb 28¹⁴, parallel with אִין; generally with לֹא before a substantival predicate, e.g. Ex 4¹⁰ לֹא אִישׁ דְּבָרִים אֶנִּי *I am not a man of words*; Am 5¹⁸.—Noun-clauses with a substantival subject, Gn 29⁷, Nu 23¹⁹, Is 22², 44¹⁹, Hag 1², ψ 22³, Jb 9³², 18¹⁷, 21⁹, 22¹⁶, 36²⁶ (with ׀ of the apodosis); 41²; in Jb 9³³ even לֹא יֵשׁ *non est* is used instead of אִין.—In Pr 18⁵ לֹא is used before an adjectival predicate; in 1 S 20²⁶ (where a preceding noun-clause is negated by בְּלִתִּי) read לֹא טָהוֹר with the LXX, for לֹא טָהוֹר. On לֹא for אִין in circumstantial clauses to express attributive ideas, see *u* below.

3. As a rule לֹא stands immediately before the verb, but sometimes is *C* separated from it (frequently to bring into special prominence another word which follows it); thus Jb 22⁷, Ec 10¹⁰ before the object and verb; Nu 16²⁹ before the subject and verb; Dt 8⁹, 2 S 3³⁴, ψ 49¹⁸, 103¹⁰, Jb 13¹⁶, 34²³ before a complementary adjunct. In Dt 32⁵ לֹא according to the accentuation even stands at the end of the clause (*they offend him not*); but undoubtedly לֹא בָנִי are to be taken together.—On the position of לֹא with the infinitive absolute, see § 113 *v*.

(b) לֹא־ is used like *μή* and *ne* to express a *subjective* and *conditional* negation, *f* and hence especially in connexion with the jussive (§ 109 *c* and *e*) to introduce prohibitions, warnings, negative desires, and requests. On לֹא־ with the imperfect, see § 107 *p*; with the cohortative, see § 108 *c*; on 2 K 6²⁷, see § 109 *h*.

Rem. 1. לֹא־ (like לֹא, see note on *a* above) may be used to form a compound *g* word, as in Pr 12²⁸ לֹא־מָוֶת *not-death* (immortality); though all the early versions read אֶל־מָוֶת. The instances in which לֹא appears to stand absolutely, equivalent to *no, certainly not* (like *μή* for *μή γένηται*), e.g. Ru 1¹³ אֶל בָּנֹתַי *my daughters*, and Gn 19¹⁸, 33¹⁰ (לֹא־נָא), are also due (see under *c*) to extreme shortening of a full clause (in 2 S 13²⁵ such a clause is repeated immediately

afterwards); thus in 2 S 1²¹, Is 62², ψ 83² יְהִי is evidently to be supplied, and in Jo 2¹³, Am 5¹⁴, Pr 8¹⁰ the corresponding jussive from the preceding imperatives, in Pr 17¹² from the preceding infinitive absolute.

h 2. אֵל, like לֹא, regularly stands immediately before the verb, but in Is 64⁸, Jer 10²⁴, 15¹⁵, ψ 6², 38² before another strongly emphasized member of the sentence.¹

i (c) אֵין construct state (unless it be sometimes merely a contracted connective form, cf. שְׁנַיִם וְשְׁנַיִם § 97 d) of אֵין non-existence (as also the absolute state, see below) is the negative of יֵשׁ existence; cf. e.g. Gn 31²⁹ with Neh 5⁵. As יֵשׁ (*he, she, it is, was, &c.*) includes the idea of *being* in all tenses, so אֵין, אֵין includes the idea of *not being* in all tenses. Hence—

k (1) The absolute state אֵין, with an evident transition to the meaning of a verbal predicate, *there does not exist*, always follows the word negated, e.g. Is 37³ (2 K 19³) וְכֹחַ אֵין לְלָרֶה and strength does not exist to bring forth; Gn 2⁵ אֵין was not present; Ex 17⁷ אֵין-אִם-הֵיִשׁ or is he not? after הֵיִשׁ is he...? (cf. Nu 13²⁰); Lv 26³⁷, Nu 20⁵, Ju 4²⁰ (אֵין no). In 1 S 9⁴ and 10¹⁴ אֵין is used in reference to a plural; 1 K 18¹⁰, Is 41¹⁷, 45²¹, 59¹¹, Mi 7², Pr 13⁴, 25¹⁴, Jb 3⁹ וְאֵין and let there be none, let none come! Ec 3¹⁹.—Cf. finally אֵין-אִם if it be not so, Gn 30¹, Ex 32³², Ju 9¹⁵, 2 K 2¹⁰.—Quite anomalous is אֵין Jb 35¹⁵ before a perfect as an emphatic negation; the text, however, can hardly be correct.

l (2) The construct state אֵין stands in its natural position immediately before the substantive whose non-existence it predicates, or before the subject of the sentence which is to be negated. To the former class belong also the very numerous instances in which אֵין is joined to a participle, e.g. 1 S 26¹² וְאֵין רֹאֶה וְאֵין יוֹדֵעַ וְאֵין מִקִּין and there was not one seeing, &c., i.e. and no man saw it, nor knew it, neither did any awake; so especially וְאֵין with a participle in subordinate circumstantial or descriptive clauses, such as Is 5²⁹ וְאֵין מְצִיל וְאֵין מְחַרֵּד and he shall carry it away, while there is none delivering, i.e. without any one's delivering it; ψ 7³, &c.; Lv 26⁶ &c., וְאֵין מְחַרֵּד without any one's making you afraid; cf. § 141 e. אֵין is used as the negation of an entire noun-clause, e.g. in Gn 39²³, Nu 14⁴² אֵין יְהוָה בְּקִרְבָּכֶם the Lord is not among you; Gn 37²⁹ אֵין-יוֹסֵף Joseph was not in the pit.

m (3) When the subject which is to be negated is a personal pronoun, it is joined as a suffix to אֵין, according to § 100 o, e.g. אֵינִי I am not, was not, shall not be; אֵינִיךָ, fem. אֵינִיךָ, thou art not, &c.; אֵינֶנּוּ, fem. אֵינֶנּוּהָ he, she is not, &c.; also absolutely, Gn 42¹³ he is (5²⁴ he was) no longer alive; אֵינֶם they are not, &c. When the accompanying predicate is a verb, it follows again (see l) in the form of a participle, since אֵין always introduces a noun-clause, e.g. Ex 5¹⁰ אֵינִי נָתַן I will not give; 8¹⁷, Dt 1³².

n Rem. In Neh 4¹⁷ אֵין אֵינִי for אֵינִי is due to its being co-ordinate with three other (substantival) subjects; these are again expressly summed up in אֵין-אֵנְחָנוּ.—In Hag 2¹⁷ אֵין אֵתְבָּרֶם the pronominal complement of אֵין appears

¹ In Jer 51³ the pointing אֵל occurs twice instead of אֵל, and is thus, in the opinion of the Masoretes, equivalent to *against him that bendeth*; but undoubtedly we should read אֵל.

to follow with the sign of the accusative;¹ but most probably we should read with the LXX אֶתְכֶם for שְׁבָכֶם.

(4) The fact that אֵין (like אֵל) always includes the idea of a verb (*is not, O was not, &c.*) led finally to such a predominance of the verbal element, that the original character of אֵין as a construct state (but cf. *i* above) was forgotten, and accordingly it is very frequently separated from its noun (substantive or participle); especially so by the insertion of shorter words (of the nature of enclitics), e.g. בּוֹ Is 1⁶, לוֹ Lv 11^{10,12}, לָהּ Gn 11³⁰, בֵּם ψ 14³, שָׁם Ju 18¹⁰, Ex 12³⁰; but cf. also ψ 5¹⁰, 6⁶, 32², and אֵין used absolutely in Ex 22², 1 K 8⁹, Ru 4⁴.—Hence, finally, even the transposition of אֵין and its noun became possible, e.g. Gn 40⁸ and 41¹⁵ וּפְתָר אֵין אֹתוֹ *and an interpreter there is not of it*; Gn 47¹³, Ju 14⁶, 1 S 21², Is 1³⁰, Jer 30¹³, Hb 2¹⁹, Pr 5¹⁷ (וְאֵין = *neve sint*; cf. *k* above, on Jb 3⁹); 30²⁷.—In Gn 19³¹, Ex 5¹⁶ אֵין is placed between the subject and predicate.

Rem. 1. Like כֹּל . . . לֹא or לֹא . . . כֹּל (see *b* above) so also אֵין כֹּל *p* expresses an absolute negation, e.g. Ec 1⁹ אֵין כֹּל-חֲדָשׁ there is no new thing, &c.; 2 S 12³, Dn 1⁴ (cf. also אֵין מְאֹמָה there is nothing, 1 K 18⁴³, Ec 5¹³); as also אֵין . . . כֹּל- Hb 2¹⁹; cf. אֵין מְאֹמָה Ju 14⁶.

2. Undoubtedly akin to אֵין in origin is the negative syllable אֵי occurring *q* in the two compounds כְּבוֹד אֵי (as a proper name, 1 S 4²¹; Baer אֵי-כְבוֹד) and אֵי-יָקִי not innocent, Jb 22³⁰; but the proper name אֵי-תָמָר is doubtful, and the fem. אֵי-בֶל very doubtful. In Ethiopic this אֵי is the most common form of negation, prefixed even to verbs.

(d) טָרָם not yet, when referring to past time is used, as a rule (§ 107 c), *r* with the imperfect, Gn 2⁵ טָרָם . . . כֹּל none . . . yet; see *b* and *p* above; Gn 19⁴, 24⁴⁵, Jos 2³, 1 S 3³; with the imperfect in the sense of a present, Ex 10⁷ הֲטָרָם תֵּדַע knowest thou not yet? Ex 9³⁰; but cf. Gn 24¹⁵, and בְּטָרָם with the perfect in ψ 90² (but see § 107 c), Pr 8²⁵.

(e) אָפַם (prop. a substantive, *cessation*) no longer, including the verbal idea *S* of existing, cf. Dt 32³⁶, Is 45^{6,14}, 46⁹; used absolutely, Am 6¹⁰ in the question הֲאָפַם עוֹד אִישׁ is there none left? &c., 2 S 9³; frequently also in the sense of *non nisi*; with אֵין paragogic (§ 90 m) אָפַם Is 47^{8,10}, Zp 2¹⁵ אָפַם עוֹד I am, and there is none else.

(f) בֶּל,² in poetic and prophetic style, and with a certain emphasis, = לֹא, *t* is used with the imperfect, e.g. Is 26¹⁴, 33^{20,23} (immediately afterwards with a perfect); Ho 7², ψ 49¹³, Pr 10³⁰ (but Is 14²¹ before the jussive, = אֵל); before an adjective, Pr 24²³; before a preposition, ψ 16², Pr 23⁷.

(g) בִּלְי with a perfect, Gn 31²⁰, Is 14⁶; with an imperfect, Jb 41¹⁸; to negative a participle, Ho 7⁸, ψ 19⁴; to negative an adjective, 2 S 1²¹.

(h) בִּלְתִּי to negative an adjective, 1 S 20²⁶; on בִּלְתִּי Ez 13⁸, see *x*; on

¹ According to De Lagarde, *Novae psalterii graeci editionis specimen*, p. 26, אֵין יִשְׁנֶתָּה ψ 3³ is also an accusative after אֵין.

² Evidently from בָּלָה to waste away, from which stem also בָּלִי and בִּלְתִּי (whence בִּלְתִּי § 90 m), originally substantives, are formed.

לֹבְלָתִי as the regular negative with the infinitive construct, see § 114 s; on לֹבְלָתִי as a conjunction, see x below.

On אִם as a negative particle in oaths (*verily not*), see § 149 c above.

- u Rem. on לֹא, אֵין, בְּלִי. To the category of negative sentences belongs also the expression of negative attributes by means of לֹא, בְּלִי *not* (both so used almost exclusively in poetic language) or אֵין with a following substantive, mostly in the simplest form of circumstantial clause; e.g. 2 S 23⁴ בָּקָר לֹא עֹבוֹת *a morning when there are not clouds, i.e. a cloudless morning*; cf. Jb 12²⁴, 26^{2b}, 38²⁶ (לֹא-אִישׁ *where no man is, i.e. uninhabited*); 1 Ch 23^{30.32} לֹא בָנִים *childless*; so also בְּלִי e.g. Jb 24¹⁰ and אֵין e.g. ψ 88⁵ *I am as a man there is not help, i.e. like a helpless man*; Is 9⁶ אֵין-רֶמֶץ *endless*; 47¹, Ho 7¹¹; אֵין-מִסְפָּר *countless*, Ct 6⁸, &c., but usually (ψ 104²⁵, &c.) like a proper circumstantial clause (cf. § 141 e) connected by Wāw, וְאֵין-מִסְפָּר.—Less frequently such periphrases take the form of relative clauses (cf. § 155 e), e.g. Jb 30¹³ עֹזֵר לֹא עֹזֵר לָמוֹ *they for whom there is no helper, i.e. the helpless* (but probably עֹזֵר is only an intrusion from 29¹², and we should read עֹזֵר *without any one's restraining them*; in 29¹² translate *the fatherless and him that had none to help him*; in ψ 72¹² וְאֵין-עַ' is used in the same sense); Hb 1¹⁴; with אֵין Is 45⁹ *thy work is that of a man who hath no hands*; Zc 9¹¹ *out of the waterless pit*.¹

- u How far such compounds finally came to be regarded by the language simply as negative adjectives, may be seen partly from the fact that they (as also relative clauses analogous to the above) are frequently co-ordinated with real adjectives, Jo 1⁶, ψ 72¹², Jb 29¹²; cf. also Is 59¹⁰, where בְּאֵין-עֲיִנַּיִם is parallel with בָּעֵרְוִים; partly from their being introduced by the sign of the dative ל, e.g. Is 40²⁹ (= *and to the powerless*); Jb 26^{2 a.3}, Neh 8¹⁰.

- zu (i) לֹא-כֵן *lest, that not*, at the beginning of a clause expressing a fear or precaution, hence especially after such ideas as *fearing*, Gn 32¹², &c. (cf. δέιδω μὴ, *verror ne*), taking heed, frequently after הִשָּׁמֶר, הִשָּׁמֶר Gn 24⁶, 31²⁴, &c., taking care, 2 K 10²³, &c. Not infrequently the idea on which לֹא-כֵן depends, is only virtually contained in the main clause, e.g. Gn 19¹⁹ *I cannot escape to the mountain* (because I am afraid), הִרְעָה לֹא-כֵן *lest some evil overtake me*; Gn 26⁹, 38¹¹; also in Gn 44³⁴ from the rhetorical question *how shall I...?* we must understand *I cannot*, governing לֹא-כֵן. This is especially the case after an appeal to do or not to do an action by which something may be prevented (in which case לֹא-כֵן is simply equivalent to the final *ne*); cf. e.g. Gn 11⁴, 19¹⁵, Nu 20¹⁸ (where לֹא-כֵן *lest* is separated from the verb by a strongly emphasized substantive); Ju 15¹² after *swear unto me*; Pr 24¹⁸.—In Gn 3²² and now, *lest he put forth his hand*, &c., לֹא-כֵן is to be regarded as virtually dependent on a cohortative, which immediately afterwards (verse 23) is changed into an historic tense; cf. also Gn 26⁷, 31³¹, 42⁴ Ex 13¹⁷, 1 S 13¹⁹, 27¹¹, ψ 38¹⁷, in every case after בִּי אָמַרְתִּי, בִּי אָמַר, &c. = *I thought, &c., I must beware lest, &c.*

Rem. According to § 107 q, לֹא-כֵן is naturally followed by the imperfect; for the exceptions, 2 S 20⁶, 2 K 2¹⁶, see § 107 q, note 3; cf. moreover, 2 K 10²³ רָאוּ לֹא-כֵן *look lest there be here, &c.*

¹ In Pr 9¹³ (perhaps also 14⁷; but see Delitzsch on the passage) a verbal-clause is used co-ordinately in this way as a periphrasis for an adjective.

(k) לְבִלְתִּי *that . . . not*, with the imperfect, Ex 20²⁰, 2 S 14¹⁴ (in Jer 23¹⁴ *α* read the infinitive שׁוּב for שָׁבוּ, in 27⁸ יָבֹאוּ for בָּאוּ). In Ez 13³ בִּלְתִּי רָאוּ relative clause governed by לְ = *according to things which they have not seen*.

2. Two negatives in the same sentence do not neutralize each other *y* (as in *nonnulli, non nemo*), but make the negation the more emphatic (like οὐκ οὐδεὶς, οὐκ οὐδαμῶς, *nulli—non, nemo non*); e. g. Zp 2² (if the text is correct) לֹא-יָבוֹאוּ בְּטָרָם before there shall (not) come.¹ This especially applies to the compounds formed by the union of אֵין or בְּלִי with מִן without (§ 119 *y*), e. g. Is 5⁹ (6¹¹) מֵאֵין יֹשֵׁב (for which in Jer 2¹⁵ מִבְּלִי יֹשֵׁב), prop. *without no inhabitant*, i. e. *so that no inhabitant is left there*. On the other hand, in Is 50² מֵאֵין מִן the מִן is causative, *because there is no water*; as also in Ex 14¹¹ הֲמִבְּלִי אֵין is it *because there were no . . . ?* 2 K 1^{3.6.16}. In Ec 3¹¹ מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא except that (*yet so that man cannot, &c.*).

3. The negative sometimes extends its influence from the first to *z* a second negative sentence parallel with it (which may or may not have *Wāw*); e. g. 1 S 2³ talk not so much arrogancy; let (not) boasting come out of your mouth; Ex 28⁴³, Lv 19¹², 22^{9.15 f.}, Nu 16¹⁴, 23¹⁹, Dt 7²⁵, Is 23⁴, 28²⁷, 38¹⁸, 47¹⁴, Ez 16⁴⁷, ψ 9¹⁹, 13⁵, 35¹⁹, 38², 44¹⁹, 75⁶, Jb 28¹⁷ (so לָמָּה לֹא *why . . . not ?* in Jb 3¹¹ also affects the parallel clause).

§ 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses.

The particles אֲשֶׁר, כִּי *only*, serve to introduce restrictive clauses, and אֲשֶׁר, אֲשֶׁר *also, besides, even*, intensive clauses. It is to be observed that the force of these particles does not necessarily affect the word which immediately follows (as is the case with אֲשֶׁר Gn 7²³, 34¹⁵; כִּי Gn 6⁵, Am 3²; even אֲשֶׁר הִרְקָה *hath he indeed only ?* Nu 12²; אֲשֶׁר Gn 27³⁴, Jb 7¹¹; אֲשֶׁר Dt 15¹⁷), but very frequently extends to the whole of the following sentence. Thus with אֲשֶׁר, e. g. Nu 14⁹, 1 K 17¹³, Pr 17¹¹, Jb 13¹⁵, 14²², 16⁷, 23⁶; כִּי Gn 20¹¹, 24⁸, ψ 32⁶, Pr 13¹⁰; אֲשֶׁר Gn 27³³, 32²¹ (אֲשֶׁר הִנֵּה), 44¹⁰; 1 S 22⁷, 28²⁰, Zc 9¹¹, Pr 17²⁶, 20¹¹; אֲשֶׁר Jb 14³, 15⁴.—In Mal 1¹⁰ and Jb 2¹⁰ אֲשֶׁר is placed before two co-ordinate sentences, although, strictly speaking, it applies only to the second. Cf. the analogous examples in § 150 *m*.

¹ In 1 K 10²¹ אֵין-הֶפְקֶס goes with what precedes and must be emended, with the LXX and Lucian, to כִּי הֶפְקֶס.

§ 154. Sentences connected by *Wāw*.

a *Wāw copulativum*¹ (!) serves to connect two or more sentences, or single words (on its various vocalization, cf. § 104 d-g). Its use, however, is by no means restricted merely to joining sentences which

¹ For further particulars of the use of *wāw copulativum*, see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, i. 393 ff. On its use in the co-ordination of similar tenses and moods (e.g. five imperfects consecutive in Gn 25³⁴, five perfects with וַיִּנָּם) as well as of dissimilar tenses and moods, the remarks made in the treatment of the tenses will suffice. With regard to the connexion of single nouns by וַ (which strictly speaking is always really a contraction of so many clauses into a single sentence) the following observations may be made:—

(a) Contrary to English usage, which in lengthy enumerations uses the *and* to connect only the last member of the series, in Hebrew *polysyndeton* is customary, as in Gn 12¹⁶ *wāw copulativum* six times, 24³⁵ seven times, 15¹⁹ ff. nine times, and in Jos 7²⁴ ten times. Sometimes, however, only the last two words are joined (so in a series of three members, Gn 5³², 10¹, 11²⁶, 13², 14¹, 30³⁰, &c.; the last three out of a series of four, Jer 2²⁶); less frequently only the first two, ψ 45⁹; cf. § 132 d. The formula הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה yesterday (and) the day before yesterday, Ex 5⁸, &c., is always without the copula. On the other hand, the *constructio asyndetos* in a series of verbs is used as a rhetorical expedient to produce a hurried and so an impassioned description; e.g. Ju 5²⁷ at her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay; Ex 15⁹, Dt 32¹⁵, 1 S 15⁶, Jer 4⁷, Am 5²¹, ψ 10¹⁰, 14¹, 45⁶, Jb 20¹⁹, 28⁴, 29⁸, Ct 2¹¹, 5⁶, &c.

(b) Frequently *wāw copulativum* is also *explanatory* (like *isque*, *et—quidem*, and the German *und zwar*, English *to wit*), and is then called *wāw explicativum*, e.g. Gn 4⁴ and (i.e. namely) of the fat thereof (unless it is simply copulative); Ex 24¹², 25¹² (to wit two); 27¹⁴, 28²³, Ju 17³ (in וַיִּסְכְּבָה; here as often elsewhere, to introduce an explanatory gloss, cf. Is 17⁸, Ez 3¹⁵, and especially P. Haupt, *SBOT*. Isaiah, p. 90, l. 21 ff.), 1 S 17³⁴ and that too with the bear; 1 S 13²⁰, Is 57¹¹, Jer 17¹⁰, Am 3¹¹, 4¹⁰, Ze 9⁹, Pr 3¹², Neh 8¹³, 2 Ch 23¹⁰ (but in 1 S 28³ the ו before בְּעִירֹו is to be omitted with the LXX); cf. also such combinations as מִן—וְעַד from . . . and even to . . . , Gn 13⁸, 14²³, 19⁴¹, &c.—In 1 S 6¹¹ (see Driver on the passage), 2 S 1²³, &c., ו is equivalent to *yea, and*; in Is 32⁷ even.

ו is used to express emphasis (=and especially), e.g. in Gn 3¹⁶ וְהָרִינָה; Is 2¹, ψ 18¹, perhaps also in Jb 10¹⁷ *yea, a whole host*; 2 Ch 16¹⁴.—An undoubted example of what is called *wāw concomitantiae* occurs in Jb 41¹² a seething pot וַאֲמֹן with burning rushes; cf. Ex 10¹⁰ (with your little ones), 12⁸, Lv 1¹², Is 42⁵. In Arabic this *wāw concom.* is followed by the accusative.

ו—ו is used in the sense of *both—and* in ψ 76⁷, Dn 1³, 8¹³. On ו—ו as meaning *sive—sive*, cf. § 162 b.

(c) See the Lexicon on adverbs used in a copulative sense, such as אֲנִי also; moreover, summing up a number, e.g. אֲנִי—אֲנִי both together, Gn 27⁴⁵, Pr 17¹⁵; אֲנִי—אֲנִי all together; as an intensive and, e.g. Gn 30⁸, 37⁷, 1 S 30⁸; cf. also such examples as 1 S 24¹² *see, yea see!* אֲנִי—אֲנִי or אֲנִי—אֲנִי Gn 24⁴⁴ = *both—and*; אֲנִי occurs three times in Gn 24²⁵ and 32²⁰; also אֲנִי, which is generally still more intensive, in the sense of *also, in addition to this, even*, and belongs rather to poetry, and to the later language; frequently also equivalent to a mere *and*, but sometimes adversative *but now*, ψ 44¹⁰, &c.; and אֲנִי—אֲנִי (also three times), equivalent to *both—and*; cf. אֲנִי—אֲנִי and even, Lv 26⁴⁴; אֲנִי—אֲנִי prop. *add to this also that*, equivalent to *not to mention*, according to the context either *quanto magis* or *quanto minus*.

are actually co-ordinate. Frequently the language employs merely the simple connexion by *Wāw*, even to introduce an antithesis (Gn 17²¹, 19¹⁹, Lv 2¹², Jb 6²⁵, and very frequently in circumstantial noun-clauses), or when one of the two clauses is not co-ordinated, but subordinated to the other. On the use of ׀ to introduce circumstantial clauses, cf. especially § 141 e and § 142 d; introducing causal clauses, § 158 a; comparative clauses, § 161 a; final clauses, § 165 a; consecutive clauses, § 166 a. On *wāw apodosis*, cf. § 143 d, and the sections there cited; on the use of *Wāw* in numerical sayings, cf. § 134 s.

Rem. Sometimes *wāw copulativum* joins a sentence apparently to what immediately precedes, but in reality to a sentence which is suppressed and which must, therefore, be supplied from the context. So especially ׀ with imperatives to express inferences, e.g. 1 K 2²² וְשֹׁאֵלִי ask now rather; Ez 18³² for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth . . . , וְהִשִּׁיבוּ wherefore turn yourselves. Also at the beginning of a speech in loose connexion with an act or speech of another person, e.g. Ex 2²⁰, 2 S 18¹¹, 24³, 2 K 4^{14,41}, 7¹³, 2 Ch 25⁹; cf. also Jos 7⁷ (וְלִי), ψ 2¹⁰, 4⁴, Is 8⁷. Sometimes the suppression of the protasis is due to passionate excitement or haste, which does not allow time for full expression; this is especially illustrated by Nu 12¹⁴, 20³ (וְלִי), 1 S 10¹², 15¹⁴, 22¹⁴, 28¹⁶, 2 S 18¹², 24³, 1 K 2²² (וְלִי), 2 K 1¹⁰, 7¹⁹ (cf. verse 2); Is 3¹⁴, Zc 2¹⁰, ψ 2⁶ (at the same time a circumstantial clause *whereas I = and yet I have, &c.*); cf. also a new clause beginning with the formula of wishing וְיָמִי Nu 11²⁹, Ju 9²⁹; on the disconnected use of וְלִי and וְיָמִי cf. § 159 dd.

§ 155. *Relative Clauses.*

See V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894 (cf. the heading of § 138 above); G. Bergsträsser, 'Das hebr. Präfix וְ,' *ZATW.* 1909, p. 40 ff.¹

1. By § 138 a, e, relative clauses are divided into two classes: those *a* which are used for the nearer definition of a noun (substantive or pronoun), and those which are not dependent on a noun. The former may be called *incomplete*, the latter *complete* relative clauses.

Complete relative clauses, as a rule (see the exceptions under n), *b* are introduced by the originally demonstrative pronoun וְאֵשֶׁר; see further in § 138 e. Similarly, incomplete relative clauses may also be introduced by וְאֵשֶׁר, or by some other demonstrative pronoun; see further in § 138 a and g-k. Very frequently, however, especially

¹ In this exhaustive article the author shows that between וְ (on the pronunciation see § 36) and וְאֵשֶׁר there is syntactically no primary difference, but only a secondary distinction which arose in the course of the development of the language, namely that וְאֵשֶׁר is preferred in combinations which are customary in the old literary language, and וְ in those which are derived from the popular language or from Aramaic.

in poetic style, the attributive relation is expressed by simple co-ordination.¹

- c The governing substantive or pronoun is frequently (in certain cases *always*) resumed by a pronominal suffix or an adverb. The resumption may, however, be omitted, just as in relative clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, &c.; see § 138 f.

d In Arabic a distinction is made between relative clauses used for the nearer definition of a *determinate* substantive (*ṣila*), and those which are attached to an *indeterminate* substantive (*ṣifa*). The former must be introduced by the demonstrative pronoun *allaḍi*, the latter are always simply co-ordinated. The same distinction was no doubt originally observed in Hebrew, since simply co-ordinated relative clauses are most commonly found after *indeterminate* substantives (see the examples below), and in cases like Dt 28⁴⁹ (גוי אשר לא-תשמע לשנו) a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; cf. Is 66¹³, and especially 1 S 3¹¹), the addition of אֲשֶׁר is explained from the special stress laid on the indeterminate substantive,² a nation of such a kind, thou understandest not their tongue. On the other hand, in poetic style at least, אֲשֶׁר is somewhat frequently omitted even after a determinate noun, but only rarely in prose (except by the Chronicler; cf. 1 Ch 9²², 12²⁵, 29¹ (read prob. אֲשֶׁר for אֹהֶד), 2 Ch 15¹¹; after בָּל־ 1 Ch 29⁸, 2 Ch 18²³, 30¹⁷, 31¹⁹, Ezr. 1⁵, but also Gn 39⁴; for further instances, see Driver, *Introd.*⁸, p. 537, no. 30); so Ex 18²⁰, Ju 8¹, 20¹⁵, 1 K 13¹² (= which way), so 2 K 3⁸, 2 Ch 18²³; Neh 13²³; after a pronominal subject, 1 S 6⁹. In Jer 52¹² for עֶמֶר read עִמֶר with the LXX.

- e 2. If the nearer definition of a substantive or pronoun is effected by simple co-ordination of the relative clause, it may take the form—

(a) Of a noun-clause, e.g. 2 S 20²¹ a man of the hill country of Ephraim שְׁבַע שְׁמוֹ whose name was Sheba; Zc 6¹², Jb 1¹, 3¹⁵ with princes לָהֶם זָהָב that had gold; ψ 11⁴, Pr 22¹¹; when referring to a noun-suffix, e.g. ψ 49¹⁴ לָמוֹ בָּסָל רַכְּבָם יְהוָה this is the way of them who have (self)-confidence.—On periphrases of this kind to express negative attributes, as in Jb 38²⁶ עַל-אֶרֶץ לֹא-אִישׁ on a land where no man is, see § 152 u, and cf. for this very short form of the relative clause, Gn 15¹³ לָהֶם לֹא בְּאֶרֶץ in a land that belongs not to them; Dt 32¹⁷ (לְשִׂרִים לֹא אֱלֹהִים); Hb 1⁶, Pr 26¹⁷ (לֹא-לוֹ).

f (b) Of a verbal clause.

Here we must distinguish the cases in which the retrospective pronoun—

- (1) Is the subject of the relative clause, and is contained in the

¹ The old view that all these cases arise from the omission of אֲשֶׁר is incorrect. These co-ordinated attributive clauses are rather a mere subdivision of the various kinds of circumstantial clauses (see § 156) which may be attached to a *nomen regens*. Cf. in English *this is the letter (which) he wrote to me*.

² So Baumann, op. cit., p. 14 f., following Böttcher, *Lehrbuch*, ii. 80.

verb; so after a determinate substantive, ψ 34⁹ *happy is the man* יְחַסְדֵּהוּ *that trusteth in him*; Jb 3^{3b} הַלַּיְלָה אָמַר *the night which said*; after ψ 71¹⁸; referring to a vocative, which is determinate in itself even without the article, Is 54¹, or to a noun-suffix (see under e), ψ 16⁴; after an indeterminate substantive, e. g. Jb 31¹² *it is a fire* (that) *devoureth unto Abaddon*; Dt 32^{17b}, 1 S 6⁹, Is 55¹³, 56², ψ 68³¹, 78⁶, Pr 30¹⁷, La 1¹⁰, 2 Ch 28⁹; referring to the suffix in הִנְנִי Is 28¹⁶, prop. *behold me, who have laid, &c.*, but perhaps the participle יֹסֵר is to be read; 29¹⁴, 38⁵ (but probably again the participle יוֹסֵף should be read instead of the imperfect); Ez 25⁷. The relative clause is used in this way especially to supply the place of an adjective, e. g. Gn 49²⁷ וְאֵבֶר יִטְרֹף *a wolf that ravineth, i. e. a ravining wolf*; Is 51¹²; to express a negative quality, e. g. Is 40²⁰, Ho 4¹⁴ עַם לֹא־יָבִין *an undiscerning people*.

Rem. Very frequently such relative sentences are attached to substantives ^g which have the particle of comparison כִּי, e. g. Jb 7² כְּעֹבֵד וְשֹׂאֲרֵי צֶלֶל *as a servant that earnestly desireth the shadow, &c.*; Dt 32¹¹, Is 62¹, Jer 23²⁹, Ho 6³, ψ 42², 83¹⁵, Jb 9²⁶, 11¹⁶; so also after כִּמּוֹ ψ 58⁵; after a determinate substantive, e. g. Is 53⁷ (but the better reading is כִּשְׁהָ without the article), 61^{10f}, Hb 2¹⁴, ψ 49^{13, 21}, 125¹; see also the examples under h. Sometimes it seems simpler in such cases, to take the verb directly as predicate to the preceding substantive, and to explain כִּי (for כִּי־אֲשֶׁר; see *Comparative Clauses*, § 161 b) as a conjunction—a view which even Hupfeld was ready to accept, at least as regards ψ 90⁵, 125¹, Is 53⁷, 61¹¹, but it can hardly be right.

(2) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun represents an ^h accusative of the object, or would do so if not suppressed, as it usually is in such cases in relative clauses with אֲשֶׁר, cf. § 138 b. Examples with the retrospective pronoun are, Dt 32¹⁷ אֱלֹהִים לֹא יָדְעוּם *gods whom they knew not* (see also the end of the verse); after a substantive with כִּי (see above, g), Jer 23⁹, Jb 13²⁸. Without a retrospective pronoun, after a determinate substantive, Ju 8¹, ψ 33¹² (preceded by a relative clause with אֲשֶׁר); Jb 28¹. Other examples of this kind, though the article is omitted according to poetic usage, are Is 15⁷ וְיִתְּרָה עֲשָׂה, for which Jer 48³⁶ וְיִתְּרָה עֲשָׂה with the substantive in the construct state governing the relative clause, see § 130 d), ψ 7¹⁶, 51¹⁰, La 1²¹.—Without the retrospective pronoun, after an indeterminate substantive, e. g. Is 6⁶ רֹצֵף בְּמִלְחָמָה לָקַח מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ *a live coal which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar*; Ex 15¹⁷, Is 42¹⁶ (48¹⁷, ψ 25¹², all after בְּדֶרֶךְ; but ψ 32⁸ בְּדֶרֶךְ־וּ חֵלֶף; Is 64²; Ec 10⁵ (in 6¹ the same clause with אֲשֶׁר); moreover, in Jer 14¹⁸ read with the LXX אֶל־אֶרֶץ לֹא יָדְעוּ *into a land (that) they know not*.

(3) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun is dependent on ⁱ a preposition, or its place is taken by the adverb שָׁם, as in Jer 2⁶ end.

Thus after a determinate substantive, ψ 18³ צִירִי אֶחָסֶה-בּוֹ *my rock in which I take refuge*; Ex 18²⁰, Is 42¹; in Jb 3^{8a} also, the omission of the article with וְ is only a poetic licence. After an indeterminate substantive, Jer 2⁶, last clause but one; ψ 32².

k In this case also the retrospective word is not infrequently suppressed, giving rise to extremely short, bold expressions, such as Is 51¹ *look unto the rock* הַצֵּבֶתָם (whence) *ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit* הַבְּרִיתָם (whence) *ye were digged*; Jb 21²⁷ *the devices* (where-with) *ye act violently against me*.—A retrospective adverb is suppressed in Jb 38¹⁹ *where is the way* (to the place where) *the light dwelleth?* cf. 38²⁴.

l Rem. 1. The omission of the retrospective word occurs most frequently in relative clauses which are governed by the construct state of a preceding substantive (especially an expression of time) and hence are virtually in the genitive. In addition to the instances already given in § 130 d, cf. the following: after בַּיּוֹם Lv 7³⁶, ψ 56¹⁰; after מִיּוֹם Jer 36²; after simple יּוֹם ψ 56⁴ (יּוֹם אִירָא *on the day when I am afraid*); after בְּעֵת 2 Ch 29²⁷ (הַחֵל הָעוֹלָה) *at the time when the burnt offering began*; 2c²², 24¹¹, Jb 6¹⁷; after לְעֵת Dt 32³⁵; after עֲרֵעַת Mi 5²; after מִצֵּת ψ 4⁸ *thou hast put gladness in my heart more than* (their gladness) *at the time (when) their corn and their wine are increased*.

m 2. The agreement (§ 138 d) of the retrospective pronoun with a pronominal regens in the 1st or 2nd person also takes place in a simple co-ordinated relative clause in 1 S 26¹⁴ *who art thou* (that) *criest?* Cf., however, Is 63¹⁹ *we are become as they over whom* (בָּם not בָּנוּ) *thou no longer bearest rule*.

n 3. Occasionally—chiefly in poetic or otherwise elevated style—even independent relative clauses are simply co-ordinated with a regens, whereas we should expect them always to be preceded by a demonstrative pronoun, on the analogy of the examples in § 138 e. The suppressed pronoun would stand—

(a) As subject. Is 41²⁴ *an abomination* (is he) *that chooseth you* (but read perhaps לְבַחֵר); Jb 30¹³, cf. § 152 u.

(b) As object, Is 41², with a retrospective pronoun; Mal 2¹⁶ וְכִסָּה *and him that covereth* (or read וְכִסָּה ?); Jb 29¹² *I delivered . . . the fatherless also, and him that had none to help him*.

(c) In the genitive governed by a substantive (cf. § 130 d), Ex 4¹³ שְׁלַח-נָא בִּידִתְּשִׁיחָה *send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*, i.e. by the hand of some one else; ψ 65³ and Pr 8³², verbal-clauses after אֲשֶׁר *O the happiness of the man, &c.*; ψ 81⁶, 141⁹, Jb 29¹⁶, La 1¹⁴; after בָּל Gn 39⁴, but we must certainly read here, with the Samaritan and LXX, בָּל-אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלֵנוּ as in verses 5 and 8; Ex 9⁴; verbal-clauses after בָּל 1 Ch 29³, 2 Ch 30¹⁹, 31¹⁹, Ezr 1⁵.

(d) Governed by a preposition; so verbal-clauses after אַחֲרֵי Jer 2⁸; after אֵל (= *to the place where*), 1 Ch 15¹², but Ex 23²⁰ before the same

verb *אֶל-הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר*; after *בְּ* Jer 2¹¹, 2 Ch 1⁴ (*בְּהֵי' = בְּהֵה' = to the place where*); after *לִי* Is 65¹ *שָׁאֵלוּ לִי* by them *that asked not for me* . . . *לֹא בִקְשָׁנִי* them *that sought me not*; Ez 13³ *אֵלֶּיךָ הָיוּ* that which *they have not seen*, but the text is hardly correct; after *עַל* *פְּ* 119¹³⁶, cf. § 158 b; after *עַם* 2 Ch 16⁹.—A noun-clause follows *לִי* in Neh 8¹⁰. An analogous instance in Aramaic is Ezr 5¹⁴ *to one whose name was Sheshbazzar* [so in the papyri, see the Lexicon, p. 1116^a].

§ 156. Circumstantial Clauses.

1. The statement of the particular circumstances under which *a* a subject appears as performing some action, or under which an action (or an occurrence) is accomplished, is made especially (apart from relative clauses, see § 155) by means of noun-clauses connected by *Wāw* with a following subject (see further on this kind of *circumstantial clause* in § 141 e), and by verbal-clauses (see § 142 d). Very frequently, however, such statements of the particular circumstances are subordinated to the main clause by being simply attached, without *Wāw*, either as noun-clauses, sometimes extremely short (see c), or as verbal-clauses (see d-g).

Rem. Among relative clauses of this kind the commonest are the various *b* noun-clauses, which are most closely subordinated to a preceding substantive without *אֲשֶׁר*, e. g. Gn 16¹²; also statements of weight, Gn 24²²; of name, Jb 1¹ (also introduced by *וַיִּשְׁמָהוּ* Gn 24²⁹, 1 S 1¹, &c., or *וַיִּשְׁמָהוּ* Gn 16¹, 22²⁴, &c.); of a condition of body, Ju 1⁷, and others.—Noun-clauses which begin with *wāw* and the predicate have a somewhat more independent character than those introduced by *wāw* and the subject¹ (Gn 10¹, &c.). The former, however, are also to be regarded as circumstantial clauses, in so far as they describe a state which is simultaneous with the principal action; thus Is 3⁷ *I will not be an healer, וְכִבְיֹתִי אֵין לָחִים* while in my house is neither bread nor clothing; Is 6⁶ (Am 7⁷); 2 S 13¹⁸, 16¹. Cf. also the instances in § 152 l of *וַאֲיוֹן* followed by a participle, as *וַאֲיוֹן מַצִּיל*, &c.

2. Characteristic examples of circumstantial noun-clauses are Gn 12⁸ *c* and pitched his tent *וְהָיָה מִיָּמִים בֵּית־אֵל* with Bethel on the west and Ai on the east; Nu 22²⁴, 2 S 18¹⁴ *through the heart of Absalom, עוֹדָנִי הִי* while he was yet alive; Jer 30⁶, Ez 9² (cf. Ct 3⁸), Na 3⁸, Zc 14⁵, 2 Ch 23¹⁰; with the predicate preceding, e. g. 1 S 26¹³, *פְּ* 32⁸.—In Gn 41²⁹ a noun-clause serves to announce a state in the future.—We may also include here certain set phrases, as *פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים* face to face (prop. while face was turned towards face), Gn 32³¹, Ex 33¹¹, Dt 34¹⁰,

¹ In Dt 32³¹ this form of sequence appears to be selected for another purpose, and indeed our enemies are judges thereof, with *wāw* emphatic; to take it as a circumstantial clause is too artificial.

&c.;¹ so also to cast oneself down, אָרְצָה אַפִּים the face being turned to the earth, Gn 19¹, &c. (for אָרְצָה we find אָרָץ in 1 K 1³¹, Is 49²³).²—Cf. finally the formula אִם עַל-בָּנִים mother with children, Gn 32¹²; cf. Ho 10¹⁴ and § 119 aa, note 2.

Rem. On circumlocutions of this kind to express negative attributes by means of short noun-clauses (complete or incomplete), cf. § 152 u.

d 3. As circumstantial verbal-clauses,³ we find (1) sometimes affirmative clauses (see below), but far more frequently (2) negative clauses (see f), and among these (3) a certain number of expressions which may be regarded simply as equivalent to negative adverbial ideas (see g).

Examples of (1) Is 5^{11b} woe unto them, that tarry late in the evening, יַיִן יִדְלִיקם while wine inflames them; Is 1⁵, 10²⁴, 30³¹, Jer 7²⁶, 20¹⁵, ψ 4³, 5¹², 21¹³, 62⁵. The circumstantial verbal-clause is used to particularize an action which has before been expressed generally, in Gn 44¹², 48¹⁴ = crossing his hands; Dt 2²⁷, Ju 6¹⁹; antithetically, 1 K 13¹⁸ לֹא בָחַשׁ לוֹ wherewith however he lied unto him. The verbal-clause seems to assign a reason in ψ 7⁷ מִשְׁפָּט צִוִּיתָ since thou hast commanded judgement; a consequence in ψ 103^{5,4}.

e Rem. On the cases in which an imperfect in the sense of a final clause is subordinated to a verb of motion (generally קָם), see § 120 c.

f Of (2), subordinate verbal-clauses with לֹא (in English usually rendered by *without* and the gerund, if the subject be the same as in the principal clause), e.g. Lv 1¹⁷ לֹא יַבְדִּיל לֹא without dividing it asunder; Jb 31³⁴; לֹא with the perfect is so used in Gn 44⁴, Ex 34²⁸, 1 S 30², Jb 20²⁶ (without its being blown upon it). With a different subject, equivalent to a consecutive clause in English, Is 27⁹ לֹא-יָקֻמוּ so that they shall rise up no more.—Moreover, verbal-clauses in the same sense (*without* doing, &c.) are frequently connected by וְלֹא; cf. 1 S 20², Jb 24²², 42³; in a concessive sense, Is 33¹, ψ 44¹⁸.

g Of (3), cf. לֹא יָדַע (prop. he knows it not) unawares, ψ 35⁸, Pr 5⁶ לֹא יַחְמֹל unsparingly, Is 30¹⁴ (after an infinitive absolute); Hb 1¹⁷, Jb 6¹⁰ (but לֹא יַחְמֹל); Jb 16¹³, 27²²; see f at the end); לֹא כִּתְרוּ (prop. they hide not) openly, Is 3⁹ (but

¹ The expression הִתְרָאָה פְּנִים to look one another in the face (i. e. to contend in combat) 2 K 14^{8,11}, 2 Ch 25^{17,21}, is probably only a shortened form for הִתְרָאָה פְּנִים אֶל-פְּנִים.

² That אָרְצָה (אָרָץ) is really to be regarded as a virtual predicate to אַפִּים, and not אַפִּים as a *casus instrumenti*, is seen from Is 49²³, where אָרָץ אַפִּים precedes the verb.

³ Some examples of these have been already discussed in another connexion above, § 120 a-c.

⁴ In Gn 21¹⁴ the circumstantial verbal-clause שָׁם עַל-שִׁכְמָה is only due to a harmonizing transposition; read וְאֶת-הַיֶּלֶד שָׁ עַ' ש'. According to the source used in cap. 21 Ishmael was still a young child; according to 17²⁵ he was about 16 or 17 years old.

Jb 15¹⁸ בְּלִי חֲשֵׁךְ ; (prop. *he restrains not*) *unceasingly*, Is 14⁶ ; בְּלִי־יָמוּט Jb 41¹⁵ (ψ 93¹ בְּלִי־תַמוּט) and לֹא יָמוּט Is 40²⁰ (*without tottering*) *immovably* ; cf. also לֹא אֶמְעָר without *wavering*, ψ 26¹.

§ 157. Object-Clauses (Oratio Obliqua).

Clauses which depend on a transitive verb, especially on what are *a* called *verba cordis*, i. e. verbs denoting any mental act, such as *to see, to hear, to know, to perceive, to believe, to remember, to forget, to say, to think, &c.*, may be subordinated to the governing verb without the help of a conjunction by simple juxtaposition (§ 120 a), or they may be co-ordinated with it either with or without *wāw copulative* (§ 120 d-h). As a rule, however, the objective clause is introduced by the conjunction כִּי *that*, less frequently by אֲשֶׁר *that*.¹

Examples:—

(a) Object-clauses without a conjunction. Besides the passages mentioned in § 120 (especially under e) there are a number of examples, in which a clause depending on a *verbum dicendi* or *sentienti* (the *oratio obliqua* of the Latin and English Grammar) is added in the form of an independent noun-clause or verbal-clause ; e. g. Gn 12¹³ אֲמַרְיָנָא אֶחָתִי אֵת say, *I pray thee, thou art my sister* ; ψ 10¹³, Jb 25^{3a,14}, Neh 6⁶ ; Zc 8²³ (after אֲשַׁמְעַע) ; ψ 9²¹ (after יִדַּע) ; verbal-clauses, e. g. ψ 50²¹ *thou thoughtest* כְּמוֹךְ הָיִיתָ־אֵהְיָה I was surely like thyself [but read הָיִי for הָיִיתָ] ; Gn 41¹⁵, Ju 9⁴⁸ *what ye have seen me do* ; Is 48⁸, Ho 7².

(b) Object-clauses introduced by כִּי, e. g. Gn 6⁵ וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה כִּי רַבָּה רָעַת הָאָדָם and the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great, &c.—Direct narration also is very frequently introduced by כִּי (analogous to the *ŕati rectitativum* ; frequently, indeed, with the secondary idea of a particle of asseveration, as in Gn 26⁹, 27²⁰), e. g. Gn 21³⁰, 22^{16 f.}, 26²², 29³², 37³⁵, Jos 2²⁴, &c., even when the direct narration is not expressly indicated, Gn 4²⁵, 32³¹, 41^{51 f.}, Ex 18⁴.—On the expression of a second object by means of a clause introduced by כִּי, see § 117 h.²

(c) Object-clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, e. g. Est 3⁴ בְּיַהֲגִיר לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר־הוּא כִּי־הוּא for he had told them that he was a Jew ; 1 S 18¹⁵, Ez 20²⁶, Ec 8^{12,3} even before direct narration, 1 S 15²⁰, 2 S 1⁴. Somewhat frequently אֲשֶׁר is preceded by

¹ On these clauses with כִּי and אֲשֶׁר and generally on clauses which we should render as subordinate, cf. P. Dörwald 'Zur hebr. Syntax' in *Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädag.* 1890, p. 115 ff.

² Instead of a complete objective clause we sometimes find a kind of accusative and infinitive construction, especially after נָתַן (prop. *to give up*) in the sense of *to allow*, e. g. Nu 21²³ וְלֹא־נָתַן סִיחֹן אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל עֲבַר בְּנַבְלֹו and Sihon did not suffer Israel to pass through his border ; 20²¹ ; followed by an infinitive with לְ, e. g. Gn 20⁶, 31⁷, Ex 3¹⁹.—Cf. also the analogous examples in Dt 28⁵⁶ (after נָפַח *to venture* ; see § 113 d) ; Ju 11²⁰ (after הֵאֱמִין *to trust*) ; 1 K 19⁴ (after שָׁאַל *to request*).

³ In Jer 28⁹ a *subject*-clause is thus introduced by אֲשֶׁר instead of the usual כִּי.

the *nota accusativi* אַחֲרֵי (equivalent to the circumstance, the fact, that), e.g. Jos 2¹⁰, 1 S 24^{11,19}, 2 S 11²⁰, Is 38³, but in Gn 30²⁹, Dt 29¹⁵ equivalent to the way in which.

§ 158. Causal Clauses.

- a* A complete clause, assigning the reason for statements, demands, threats, &c., sometimes follows with the simple *wāw copulative*, e.g. ψ 60¹³ *give us help against the adversary, and (for) vain is the help of man*; Gn 6¹⁷ (וְאֵינִי), 22¹², Ex 23⁹, Jb 22¹², perhaps also ψ 7¹⁰; or even without *Wāw*, e.g. Gn 17¹⁴. As a rule, however, special conjunctions in various combinations are used to introduce causal clauses.
- b* The most common causal conjunctions are כִּי Is 3¹⁶, &c., and יֵעָן אֲשֶׁר *because*, prop. *on account of the fact that*; both, however, may also be shortened to the simple יֵעָן Nu 20¹², &c., or to כִּי *because*, Gn 3^{14,17}, &c., or to אֲשֶׁר Gn 30¹⁸, 31⁴⁹, 34^{13,27}, 1 S 15¹⁵, 20⁴², 26^{16,23}, 1 K 3¹⁹, 8³³, Ho 14⁴, Ze 1¹⁵; also בְּאֲשֶׁר Gn 39^{9,23}. On the other hand, the simple יֵעָן is sometimes repeated for emphasis, יֵעָן וְיֵעָן (something like the German *sintemal und alldieweil*) Lv 26⁴³, Ez 13¹⁰ (without וְ 36³); also עַל-אֲשֶׁר 2 S 3³⁰, and עַל-כִּי Dt 31¹⁷, Ju 3¹², Mal 2¹⁴ *on the ground that*; עַל-דִּבְרֵי אֲשֶׁר *because of the circumstance that*, Dt 23⁵; עַל-כֵּן אֲשֶׁר *for this very cause that*, Jer 3⁸. But just as the simple יֵעָן is used for אֲשֶׁר, so also the simple עַל- with the perfect stands for אֲשֶׁר ψ 119¹³⁶, Ezr 3¹¹; cf. עַל-כֵּן Gn 31²⁰ and מִכֵּן Dt 28⁵⁵ both with the perfect, equivalent to *because . . . not*.—Cf. further אֲשֶׁר עָקַב Gn 22¹⁸, 26⁵, 2 S 12⁶, all with the perfect, and עָקַב כִּי (2 S 12¹⁰ with the perfect; Am 4¹² with the imperfect) prop. *in return for the fact that*; similarly again the simple עָקַב Nu 14²⁴ with the perfect, and Dt 7¹², 8²⁰ with the imperfect; finally, מֵאֲשֶׁר Is 43⁴ *arising from the fact that*, = *because*; תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר 1 S 26²¹, &c., and תַּחַת כִּי Dt 4³⁷, Pr 1²³ *for the reason that*.
- c* Rem. 1. The preposition עַל (*because of, on account of*) with the infinitive (§ 114 e) is frequently used as the equivalent of a full causal clause; cf. e.g. Am 1^{3,6,13}, 2^{1,6}. Such a construction with the infinitive may, however, according to § 114 r, be continued by means of a finite verb, in which case עַל- governs the verb as a conjunction; e.g. Am 1⁹ וְזָכְרוּ . . . וְלֹא יִסְמְרוּ *because they delivered up . . . and remembered not, &c.*; 1¹¹, 2⁴; without *Wāw*, Is 30¹⁴.
- d* 2. The choice of tense is regulated by the general principles stated in § 106 ff., viz. the perfect (cf. especially § 106 f) refers to causes already brought fully into effect, the imperfect to those which may contingently arise; cf. e.g. Dt 7¹², 8²⁰, 1 K 8³³, where the imperfect leaves the possibility still open that the persons addressed will perhaps escape the threatened punishments by avoiding disobedience.—Cf. further, § 111 h on the imperfect consecutive, and § 112 nn on the perfect consecutive in the apodosis to causal clauses.

¹ Also כִּי-עַל-כֵּן prop. *for therefore*, Gn 18⁵, 19⁸, 33¹⁰, 38²⁸, Nu 10³¹, 14⁴⁸, 2 S 18²⁰ *Qerê*, and אֲשֶׁר עַל-כֵּן Jb 34²⁷, always mean *forasmuch as*.

§ 159. Conditional Sentences.

Cf. H. Ferguson, 'The Use of the Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew' (*Journal of the Society of Bibl. Lit. and Exeg.*, Middletown, Conn., June and September, 1882).—P. Friedrich, *Die hebr. Conditionalsätze*, Königsberg, 1884 (Inaug.-Diss.).—Driver, *Use of the Tenses*, 3rd ed., p. 174 ff.

1. The great variety of construction in conditional sentences is *a* owing to the fact that it frequently depends on the subjective judgment of the speaker, whether he wishes a condition to be regarded as *capable of fulfilment* (absolutely, or at least possibly), thus including those already fulfilled, or as *incapable of fulfilment*. On this distinction depends the choice both of the conditional particle to be used (see below), and especially (as also in Greek and Latin) of the tense. The use of the latter is naturally determined according to the general principles laid down in § 106 ff.¹ In the following sketch, for the sake of clearness, conditional sentences *without* conditional particles will be first discussed (under *b*), and afterwards sentences *with* these particles (under *l*).

2. The relation between condition and consequence may be expressed, *b* as in English, by the simple juxtaposition of two clauses. At the same time, it is to be observed in general as a fundamental rule (in accordance with the original character of the two tenses), that the *imperfect*, with its equivalents (the jussive, cohortative, imperative, perfect consecutive, and participle), is used to express a condition and consequence which are regarded as being *capable of fulfilment* in present or future time, while the *perfect* represents a condition already fulfilled in the past, and its consequence as an accomplished fact. The other use of the perfect—to represent conditions regarded as *impossible*—occurs only in connexion with particles.

Examples:—

(a) *Imperfect* (cf. § 107 x) in protasis and apodosis, Jos 22¹⁸, ψ 104^{28 ff.} *C* יִלְקָטוּן² לָהֶם הֵתֵן לָהֶם (if) thou givest unto them, they gather, &c.; ψ 139¹⁸, Pr 12¹⁷, Jb 20²⁴, Ec 1¹⁸, Neh 1⁸; with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis, Ju 13¹²; with the jussive, Jb 10¹⁶; with the cohortative, Pr. 1²³; with the perfect, Is 26¹⁰ (yet will he not learn righteousness; the apodosis forcibly denies

¹ It may, moreover, happen that a different idea is introduced in the apodosis, from that with which the protasis started—a source of many further variations.

² On the termination יִ- cf. § 47 m. In verse 28 *b* also יִשְׁבְּעוּן is probably to be explained from its immediately preceding the greater *pause*. These terminations in verses 28–30 and ψ 139¹⁸ can scarcely have any connexion with the conditional sentence, although it is strange that יִ- in Nu 32²³ appears after לֹא-וְאִם in the protasis. In Nu 16²⁹, 32²⁰ יִ- as before נ (as in Jb 31¹⁰ in the apodosis) is to be explained from the dislike of hiatus.

what the imperfect in the protasis had represented as still conceivable; cf. Ho 8¹²; with the perfect consecutive, Gn 47²⁵, Ex 33⁵; with the protasis suppressed, Jb 5⁸ (see § 107 x).

d (b) *Jussive* in protasis (cf. § 109 h, i) and apodosis, ψ 104¹⁰ תִּשְׁתַּחֲשֶׁךְ (if) thou makest darkness, it is night; imperfect in the apodosis, ψ 104^{29b}; cohortative Pr 1²³. Also in Ex 7⁹ יְהִי לְחֹתֵן it shall become a serpent, is the apodosis to a suppressed protasis *if thou cast it down*; so in 2 K 5¹⁰ וְיִשָּׁב is the apodosis to a protasis *if thou wash*, contained in what precedes.

e (c) *Cohortative* (see § 108 e) in the protasis; perfect in the apodosis, ψ 40⁶; imperfect consecutive, Jb 19¹³ אֶקוּמָה וְיִדְבְּרוּבֵי (if) I arise, they speak against me; on the cohortative in the apodosis, cf. § 108 f.

f (d) *Imperfect consecutive* in the protasis (§ 111 x), ψ 139¹¹ וְאָמַר if I say, &c. (with a noun-clause as the apodosis); with a frequentative perfect consecutive in the apodosis, 1 S 2¹⁶.

g (e) *Perfect consecutive* in the protasis and apodosis (see the examples, § 112 k_k and l), Gn 44²² וְשׁוּב אָבִיו וּמָת and should he leave his father, his father would die; 9¹⁵, 44²⁹, Ex 4¹⁴, 12¹³, 1 S 16², 19³, 2 S 13²³, 1 K 8³⁰; with frequentative perfects, Ex 16²¹ (referring to the past, Jer 20⁹); with imperfect in the apodosis (being separated from the Wāw by לֹא), Nu 23²⁰, Jb 5²⁴; introduced by an infinitive absolute, 1 K 2³⁷; an interrogative clause in the apodosis, Lv 10¹⁹; a noun-clause, ψ 37¹⁰, Jb 7²¹.

h (f) *A simple perfect* (to represent actions which are to be regarded as completed) in the protasis and apodosis, Pr 18²² מָצָא אִשָּׁה מְצָא טוֹב has one found a wife, he has found a good thing; an imperfect in the apodosis, Jb 19⁴, 23¹⁰; an imperfect consecutive, Ex 20²⁵, Pr 11², Jb 3²⁵, 23^{13b}, 29¹¹; an interrogative clause, Nu 12¹⁴, Jb 7²⁰ if I have sinned (prop., well, now I have sinned!) what can I do unto thee? 21³¹, 35⁶, Am 3⁸; a noun-clause, Jb 27¹⁹.

i (g) *A participle* as *casus pendens* (cf. § 143 d, and the sections of the Grammar there cited, esp. § 116 w) or a complete noun-clause in the protasis; the apodosis mostly introduced by wāw apodosis, e.g. Pr 23²⁴ Keth. יוֹלֵד הָכֶם וְיִשְׁמַח בּוֹ if one begetteth a wise child, he shall have joy of him; with perfect frequentative in the apodosis, 1 S 2¹³, &c.; but also with a simple imperfect, e.g. Ex 21¹² (cf. § 112 n); with an interrogative imperfect, 2 K 7^{2.19}; with an interrogative perfect, Ju 6¹³.

k (h) *Infinitive with preposition* (also as the equivalent of a conditional clause) in the protasis, and a perfect consecutive in the apodosis (cf. § 112 mm), e.g. 2 S 7^{14f}. וְגַ' בְּהַעֲוֹתוֹ וְהִכְהַתִּיתִי וְגַ' if he commit iniquity, I will correct him; Ex 34^{34f}. (with imperfect, followed by perfects frequentative in the apodosis).

Rem. On the expression of condition and consequence by means of two co-ordinate imperatives, see § 110 f.

l 3. Particles used to introduce conditional sentences are אִם (for which in the later and latest Books sometimes הִן, see below, under w) and לוֹ¹ (1 S 14³⁰, Is 63¹⁹ לֹא; Ec 6⁶, Est 7⁴ אֵלַי, from לוֹ אִם) if, negative לֹא אִם and לוֹ לֹא (לֹאִי) unless; כִּי supposing that (Lat. ut), in case that, sometimes used almost in the same sense as אִם. With regard to the difference between אִם (לֹא אִם) and לוֹ (לֹאִי), the fundamental rule is that אִם is used if the condition be regarded either as already fulfilled, or if it, together with its consequence, be thought of as possibly (or

¹ On לוֹ cf. Kohler in Geiger's *Zeitschr. für Wiss. und Leben*, vi (1868), p. 21 ff.

probably) occurring in the present or future. In the former case, אִם is followed by the perfect, in the latter (corresponding to the Greek εἰ with the present subjunctive) by the imperfect or its equivalent (frequently in the apodosis also). On the other hand, לִי (לִי־לֵא) is used when the condition is to be represented as *not fulfilled* in the past, or as *not capable of fulfilment* in the present or future, and the consequence accordingly as not having occurred or never occurring. In the former case, לִי and לִי־לֵא are necessarily followed by the perfect (mostly also in the apodosis) corresponding to the Greek εἰ with the indicative of an historic tense, and the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive. In the latter case (which is extremely rare) the perfect, or the participle, or even the imperfect, may be used.

Rem. Since it again frequently depends on the subjective judgement of the speaker (see under *a*), whether a condition is to be regarded as possible or impossible, we cannot wonder that the distinction between אִם and לִי is not always consistently observed. Although naturally לִי and לִי־לֵא cannot take the place of אִם and אִם־לֵא (on the strange use of לִי in Gn 50¹⁵ see below), yet conversely אִם is sometimes used where לִי would certainly be expected; cf. e.g. ψ 50¹², 137⁵, 139⁸, Ho 9¹² (cf. verse 11). These examples, indeed (אִם with the imperfect), may without difficulty be explained from the fact that the connexion of לִי with the imperfect was evidently avoided, because the imperfect by its nature indicates a still unfinished action, and consequently (as opposed to לִי) a still open possibility. But אִם is also used for לִי in connexion with the perfect, especially when an imprecation is attached by the apodosis to the condition introduced by אִם, e.g. ψ 74^{ff.} . . . אִם־עָשִׂיתִי זֹאת . . . יִרְדֶּף וְג' if I have done this . . . , let the enemy pursue my soul, &c., cf. Jb 31^{9 ff.} The speaker assumes for a moment as possible and even actual, that which he really rejects as inconceivable, in order to invoke the most severe punishment on himself, if it should prove to be the case.

On the frequent addition of an infinitive absolute to the verb in clauses with אִם see § 113 *o* above.

Examples:—

A. אִם 1. with *perfect* in the protasis to express conditions, &c., which have *n* been completely fulfilled in the past or which will be completely fulfilled in the future (the perfect is here equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, § 106 *o*). The apodosis ¹ takes—

(a) A *perfect* also, e.g. Pr 9¹² אִם־חָכְמָתָּ חֲכָמָתְךָ לֵךְ if thou art wise, thou art wise for thyself; ψ 73¹⁵ (see below on לִי).

(b) *Imperfect*, e.g. Dt 32⁴¹ אִם־שִׁנּוּתִי if I whet my glittering sword . . . אֲשִׁיב I will render vengeance, &c.; Jb 9^{15 f. 30} (in both cases we should expect לִי rather than אִם; so also in ψ 44^{21 f.}, with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis); Jb 11¹³ (the apodosis is in verse 15).

(c) *Jussive* (or *optative*), e.g. Jb 31^{9 ff.} (see *m* above); Gn 18⁸.

¹ We are not here concerned with the fact that the logical apodosis (the consequence of the condition) is sometimes mentioned before the condition; as in Gn 18^{28, 30}, Ju 11¹⁰, ψ 63^{6 f.}, 137⁶, and according to Dillmann Is 4⁴.

O (d) *Perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112 *gg*), e.g. Gn 43⁹ אֶם-לֹא הִבִּיתִיו וְג' if I bring him not . . . then I shall have sinned, &c.; Ju 16¹⁷, 2 S 15³³, 2 K 7⁴. On the other hand, e.g. Gn 47⁶, Mi 5⁷, Jb 7⁴ refer to actions already completed; in Gn 38⁹ and Nu 21⁹ the perfect with וְ is a perfect frequentative and refers to past time.

(e) *Imperfect consecutive* (see § 111 *q*), e.g. Jb 8⁴ if thy children have sinned (הִטְאִי) . . . , וַיִּשְׁלַחֵם he has delivered them, &c.

(f) *Imperative*, e.g. Gn 50⁴ אִם-נָא מְצֵאתִי הֵן בְּעֵינֶיכֶם דְּבַר-נָא וְג' if now I have found grace in your eyes, speak, I pray you, &c.; the imperative precedes in Gn 47¹⁶ and Jb 38^{4,13}.

P (g) A (complete or incomplete) noun-clause, e.g. Jer 14¹⁸ (a vivid realization of the future) if I have gone forth into the field (=if I go, &c.), then, behold, the slain with the sword! &c.; Pr 24¹⁴ (apodosis with *wāw* apodosis).

Q 2. אִם with imperfect in the protasis, to express what is possible in the present or future, as well as (according to § 107 *b*) what has continued or been repeated in the past. The apodosis takes—

(a) The *perfect*, e.g. Nu 32²³ וְאִם-לֹא תַעֲשֶׂוּן כֹּן הִנֵּה תִטְאָתֶם but if ye will not do so, behold, ye have sinned; here the apodosis represents the time when the consequence has already taken place; so also Jb 20¹²⁻¹⁴. On the other hand, Nu 16²⁹ (as also 1 S 6⁹ and 1 K 22²⁸) is a case of a pregnant construction, if these men die as all men die, then (it will follow from this) the Lord hath not sent me.

T (b) The *imperfect*, e.g. 2 K 7⁴ אִם-יִחְיֶינוּ נִחֵהּ if they save us alive, we shall live, &c.; Gn 13¹⁶, 18^{28,30}, 28²⁰ *π*, Ex 20²⁵ (the second imperfect is equivalent to a jussive); Is 1¹⁸, 10²², Am 9²⁻⁴, ψ 50¹² (where אִם ironically represents an impossibility as possible); Jb 8⁵ *f*. (with the insertion of a second condition in the form of a noun-clause); 9^{3,20}, 14⁷; a frequentative imperfect referring to the past, Gn 31⁸ אִם-כִּדְבָר יֹאמַר if (ever) he said thus . . . , וַיִּלְדוּ then they bare . . . ; Ex 40³⁷. In Gn 42³⁷ the consequence (on תָּמִית cf. § 107 *s*) precedes the condition.

(c) The *jussive* (or *optative*), e.g. ψ 137⁵; cf. § 109 *h*.

(d) The *cohortative*, e.g. Gn 13⁹, Jb 31⁷; cf. § 108 *f*.

S (e) The *perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112 *ff* and *gg*), e.g. 1 S 20⁶ אִם-פָּקַד יִפְקְדֵנִי אֲבִיר וְאִמְרַת if thy father miss me at all, then shalt thou say, &c.; Gn 24⁴¹, Ju 4²⁰; with a frequentative perfect consecutive, Gn 31⁸ if he said (as often happened) . . . , then, &c.

(f) The *imperfect consecutive*; so perhaps ψ 59¹⁶, if וַיִּלְכֶּנִּי is to be explained according to § 111 *t*.

(g) The *imperative*, e.g. Gn 31⁵⁰, 1 S 20²¹ (with *wāw* apodosis, but in verse 22 simply וְ), 21¹⁰, Jb 33⁵.

T (h) A noun-clause, e.g. Gn 4⁷, ψ 139⁸, Jb 8⁶, 31²⁶ *f*.

3. אִם with *cohortative*, e.g. Gn 30³¹; cf. the passages in § 108 *e*.

U 4. אִם with *infinitive*, Jb 9²⁷ אִם-אֶמְאָרִי prop. if my saying is (but probably we should read אֶמְאָרִיתִי).

V 5. אִם with a noun-clause, e.g. Dt 5²² (in the apodosis a perfect with *wāw* apodosis), Gn 27⁴⁶, Ju 9¹⁵ (imperative in the apodosis); 11⁹ (imperfect in the apodosis); 2 S 12⁸ (cohortative in the apodosis); Ho 12¹²; especially if the subject of the conditional clause be a personal pronoun. In an affirmative sentence this pronoun is often joined to וְ, in a negative sentence to אִין (cf. on both, § 100 *o*), while the predicate (cf. § 116 *q*) is represented by a participle, usually expressing the future, e.g. Ju 6³⁶ *f*. אִם-יִשְׁקַח מוֹשִׁיעַ

if thou wilt save, &c. ; Gn 24⁴⁹ וְאִם-יַשְׁכֶּם עֲשִׂים if ye will deal, &c. ; 1 S 23²³. In Gn 24^{42f.} the condition is expressed in a more humble form by the addition of נָא. With אִין Gn 43⁵ וְאִם-אֵינְךָ מִשְׁלֵחַ but if thou wilt not send, &c. ; 20⁷ (with imperative in the apodosis) ; Ex 8¹⁷, 9^{2f.}, 1 S 19¹¹ (all with a participle also in the apodosis). But יִשׁ and אִין may also be used after אִם without a suffix ; thus יִשׁ Gn 23⁸, 1 S 20⁸, 2 K 9¹⁵, &c., אִם-אִין (if it be not the case) Gn 30¹, Ex 32³², Ju 9¹⁵, 2 K 2¹⁰ ; cf. also אִם-כֵּן if it be so, Gn 25²².

B. הֵן if, generally supposed to be originally identical with הֵן behold!¹ w Probably, however, הֵן if, is a pure Aramaism, and since the Aramaic word never has the meaning behold, it is at least improbable that it had originally any connexion with הֵן or הִנֵּה. Cf. Ex 8²², Lv 25²⁰, Is 54¹⁵, Jer 3¹, Hag 2¹², 2 Ch 7¹³, and frequently in Job, as 9^{11,12}, 12^{14,15}, 19⁷, 23⁸, 40²³, always with wāw apodosis following, except in 13¹⁵, where consequently the meaning see is no doubt preferable.

C. לוּ if, לוּלֵא (לוּלִי) if not.

x'

1. With perfect in the protasis and apodosis (cf. § 106 p), e.g. Ju 8¹⁹; אֲלֹהִים is used in the same sense as לוּ in Est 7⁴, cf. Ec 6⁸ (with a question in the apodosis).—With the perfect in protasis and apodosis after לוּלֵא Gn 31⁴², 43¹⁰, Ju 14¹⁸, 1 S 25³⁴, 2 S 2²⁷, Is 1⁹. On the other hand, in Dt 32²⁹ לוּ with a perfect is followed by an imperfect in the apodosis, if they were wise, they would understand this ; in Mi 2¹¹ by a perfect consecutive.

2. With imperfect after לוּלֵא Dt 32²⁷, אָנֹכִי probably as the *modus rei repetitae*, y were it not that I ever and again feared, &c. ; so also the imperfect after לוּ with the apodosis suppressed, Gn 50¹⁵ supposing that Joseph should hate us ; since, according to the context, the danger was real, the use of לוּ here is strange ; conversely in other cases, e.g. ψ 73¹⁵, Jb 9^{15 f. 30}, לוּ would be more natural than אִם.

3. A noun-clause occurs after לוּ 2 S 18¹², 2 K 3¹⁴, ψ 81¹⁴, all with imperfect ז in the apodosis ; Jb 16⁴ יִשׁ לוּ, with cohortative in the apodosis.

D. כִּי supposing that, if :—

1. כִּי with perfect in the protasis, e.g. Nu 5²⁰ וְאִתָּךְ כִּי שָׁטִיתָ but thou, if thou aa hast gone astray, &c. ; with a frequentative perfect consecutive in the apodosis, Jb 7^{13 f.} ; with an imperfect consecutive, Jb 22²⁹.

2. כִּי with imperfect in the protasis, e.g. ψ 23⁴ בִּירְאֶלְךָ נָם יְהֵא, though I walk bb (have to walk) . . . , I will fear no (לֹא-אִירָא) evil ; 37²⁴ ; Ex 21² בִּי-תִקְנֶה עֶבֶר בִּי-תִקְנֶה עֶבֶר if thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve (but in verses 3–5 a series of definite conditions with definite consequences is introduced by אִם ; so also the כִּי in verse 7 is followed in verses 8–11 by the special cases with אִם ; cf. also verse 17 ff.) ; cf. Gn 4²⁴, 24⁴¹, Jb 38⁵ ; with a perfect consecutive in the apodosis, Gn 32^{18 f.}, Ex 18¹⁶ ; with a noun-clause, Is 1¹⁵.

3. כִּי with a noun-clause (and imperfect in the apodosis), 2 S 19⁸.

REMARKS.

1. In 2 K 5¹³ the particle אֲנִי (Masora אֲנִי, probably in the sense of my CC father) appears exceptionally for לוּ ; its meaning here is unquestionable, but

¹ There could be no doubt of their identity if הִנֵּה in 1 S 9⁷, 2 S 18¹¹, simply meant if. We must, however, keep to the meaning but behold.

its origin is obscure. Cf. the exhaustive discussion of Delitzsch and Wetzstein on Jb 34³⁶, where this אִם appears to be used as a desiderative particle.—Sometimes when one case has been already discussed, another of the same character is added by means of אוּ or, e.g. Ex 21³⁶ אִם נוֹדַע וְנִי or (another possible case) *it is known that, &c., i.e. but if it be known, &c.*, LXX εἰν δέ, Vulg. *sin autem*; cf. Lv 4^{23,28}, 5¹, 25⁴⁹, 2 S 18¹³; with a following imperfect, Ez 14^{17f}.—On the hypothetical use of אִם (which is interchangeable with כִּי in other senses also) Lv 4²³ (in verses 3 and 27 אִם), Dt 11²⁷ (verse 28 אִם), Jos 4²¹, see the *Lexicon*.

dd 2. The conditional sentence is frequently found in an abridged form, where the suppressed clauses can be easily supplied from the context; cf. Gn 13⁹, 24⁴⁹, 1 S 21⁶ וְאִם-לֹא and *if not, i.e. and if thou wilt not give it to me, then I take it* (perfect according to § 106 *n*) *by force*; cf. 1 S 6⁹. The use of וַיֵּשׁ alone in Ju 6¹³ is peculiar, as also וַיֵּשׁ in 2 K 10¹⁵ (where read with the LXX וַיֵּשׁ יְהוֹנָדָה יְהוֹנָדָה) in the sense of *if it be so*.—In 2 S 13²⁶, 2 K 5¹⁷ וְלֹא alone appears to be used in the sense of *if really . . . not*, in each case with a following jussive equivalent to *may there at least, &c.* (cf. § 143 *d*); but perhaps with Matthes, *ZAW*. 1903, p. 122 ff., following Kuipers, we should read וְלֹא *would that!*—In 1 S 13¹⁸, Jb 3¹⁸ the condition must be supplied from the preceding clause to complete the sentence introduced by כִּי עָתָה, in Jb 31²⁸ by כִּי, in 2 K 13¹⁹ by אִם.—The apodosis also appears sometimes in an abridged form (e.g. Gn 4²⁴, Is 43²) or is entirely suppressed, e.g. Gn 30²⁷, 38¹⁷, 50¹⁵ (see *y* above), Ex 32³², ψ 27¹³, Jb 38⁵, where properly הִנֵּה must be supplied with כִּי תִרַע as in verses 4 and 18; cf. § 167 *a*.—In ψ 8⁴, instead of the apodosis *I exclaim* which we should expect, the exclamation itself follows.

ee 3. The absolute certainty with which a result is to be expected is frequently emphasized by the insertion of כִּי Is 7⁹; 2 S 2²⁷, 19⁷, Jb 11¹⁵; or עָתָה כִּי *now verily*, Nu 22²⁹, 1 S 14³⁰ after לוֹ, Gn 31⁴², 43¹⁰ after לְיָגִל, Jb 8⁶ after אִם. On this corroborative כִּי cf. such passages as Gn 18²⁰, &c., and § 148 *d*. On אִם כִּי after an oath cf. 163 *d*.

ff 4. Sometimes the force of a hypothetical particle extends beyond the apodosis to a second conditional clause, as in the case of אִם Pr 9¹², Jb 10¹⁵, 16⁶, 22²³, and כִּי Is 43².

gg 5. In Ex 33²⁰ a negative statement takes the place of a condition with a negative consequence, *for a man doth not see me and live, instead of for if a man sees me, he does not live*; cf. the similar passages, Dt 22^{1.4} *thou shalt not see . . . and hide thyself, instead of if thou seest . . . thou shalt not hide thyself*.

§ 160. Concessive Clauses.

a Besides the use of the imperative in the sense of a concession, meant either seriously (§ 110 *a*) or mockingly (§ 110 *f*), and of concessive circumstantial clauses (§ 141 *e*, § 142 *d*, and § 156 *f*), concessive clauses may be introduced—

(*a*) By a simple אִם *if*: thus Jb 9¹⁵ with perfect, *if (=though) I had been in the right*; Is 1¹⁸ and 10²² with imperfect in reference to a contingent event.

b (*b*) By כִּי יָם *yea though*, Is 1¹⁶ with imperfect; for which we find simply יָם in Is 49¹⁵ with imperfect, *yea, though these may forget, yet . . .*; on the other hand, with perfect, Jer 36²⁵, ψ 95⁹, Neh 6¹; finally יָם כִּי *even if, though*, Ec 4¹⁴.

(c) By the preposition **עַל** governing a complete noun-clause, as Jb 16¹⁷ **עַל לֹא־הָמָס בְּכַפִּי** notwithstanding that no violence is in mine hands, or a verbal-clause, Is 53⁹. On **עַל** with the infinitive in a similar sense (equivalent to *in addition to the fact that* = *notwithstanding that*), cf. § 119 aa, note 2.

§ 161. Comparative Clauses.

1. A comparison between two facts is sometimes established by *a* simply uniting them with *wāw copulative*, especially in gnomic poetry, when facts of a moral nature are compared with those of the physical world, e. g. Jb 5⁷ *man is born unto trouble, and the sons of flame fly upward*, i. e. as the sparks by nature fly upward, so man, &c.; Jb 12¹¹ (in an interrogative form; in 34³ the same comparison as a statement); 14^{11f.}, Pr 17³, 25³, 26^{3,9,14}, 27²¹, &c.¹ Even without the connecting **וְ** Jb 24¹⁹ *drought and heat consume the snow waters*, **שָׁאוֹל תִּחָּאֵר** so doth *Sheol* those who have sinned (cf. § 155 n); cf. Jer 17¹¹.

2. The conjunction **כַּאֲשֶׁר** (cf. § 155 g; the simple **אֲשֶׁר** occurs in the *b* same sense in Ex 10⁶, 14¹³, 34¹⁸) *as, quemadmodum*, is used as a comparative conjunction (Ob¹⁵), frequently with **כֵּן** *so*, corresponding to it in the apodosis, Is 31⁴, 52^{14f.}. Sometimes, however, **כֵּן** (*so also*) occurs even after independent statements, Is 55⁹, Jer 3²⁰.—Exact coincidence of two facts is expressed in Ec 5¹⁵ by **כָּל־עֲמַת שֵׁי** *in all points as*.

Rem. On the use of **כֵּן** *as*, with single nouns or pronouns to introduce *c* comparisons, cf. 118 s; on the alleged use of **כֵּן** as a conjunction (equivalent to **כַּאֲשֶׁר**), cf. § 155 g.—It is to be further remarked that **כֵּן—כֵּן** when used in correspondence with one another, *as—so* (e. g. Lv 7⁷, Ju 8¹⁸, Is 24², Ho 4⁹; also *so—as*, Gn 18²⁶, 44¹⁸, Dt 1¹⁷, 1 K 22⁴; in Jos 14¹¹, 1 S 30²⁴ **כֵּן—כֵּן**; ψ 127⁴ and often, **כֵּן—כֵּן**, cf. Jo 2⁴), are not to be regarded as conjunctions, but as virtual substantives with a following genitive; **כַּדְּמָה כְּבָרְךָ יְהוָה** Nu 15¹⁵ properly means *the like of you shall be the like of the stranger*, i. e. *your duty shall be (also) the stranger's duty*; cf. Lv 24²².

¹ On this *wāw adaequationis*, and in general on these proverbial comparisons, see Delitzsch, *Das Salomonische Spruchbuch*, p. 9 f. Moreover, instead of entire clauses, the nouns alone (without predicates) are frequently grouped together, e. g. Pr 25²⁵, 26²¹, 27²¹ (called by Delitzsch, the 'emblematic Mashal'). The expressions **עִם נִחָשֵׁב** prop. *to be counted with some one*, ψ 88⁵, and **נִמְשָׁל עִם** *to be likened with some one*, ψ 28¹, 143⁷, also arise from the idea of comparison implied in grouping things together. On this use of **עִם** cf. Jb 9²⁶, where *with* is equivalent to *like*.

² In spite of its form this particle has originally nothing to do with **כָּל**, **כֵּל** *all*. The expression is compounded of **כֵּן** and **לְעִמָּת**, like the Aramaic **כָּל־קָבֵל** *for all*; cf. M. Lambert, *REJ.* xxx. 47.

§ 162. *Disjunctive Sentences.*

- a* The introduction of another possible case, excluding that which preceded, is effected by **וְ** *or*, e.g. Ex 21³⁶, equivalent to the Latin *vel*; but also equivalent to *aut* with an exclusive antithesis, 2 K 2¹⁶; so Is 27⁵ **וְ** = *it would then happen that*, for which elsewhere **וְ** **אִם**.
- b* In the sense of *sive—sive* we find **וְ**—**וְ**, or **וְ**—**וְ**, or **וְ**—**וְ** (see the examples in the Lexicon), also **וְ**—**וְ** Lv 5³, Nu 9¹⁴, Dt 24⁷, Is 2^{13a}, Jer 32²⁰, **וְ** 76⁷, Jb 34²⁹, perhaps also Ex 21¹⁶ (but not Pr 29⁹; cf. Delitzsch on the passage), and **וְ**—**וְ** (see § 143 *e*); cf. also **וְ**—**וְ** (in Gn 24⁴⁴ **וְ**—**וְ**) *both—and*; but **וְ**—**וְ** (in Gn 21²⁶ **וְ**—**וְ**) *neither—nor*. On disjunctive questions, see § 150 *g*.

§ 163. *Adversative and Exceptive Clauses.*

- a* 1. After negative sentences (especially after prohibitions) the antithesis (*but*) is introduced by **וְ** **אֲמַרְנָא**, e.g. 1 S 8¹⁹ *and they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us*; **וְ** 1², &c.; frequently also by **וְ** alone, e.g. Gn 18¹⁵, 19², or even simply connected with **וְ**, Gn 17⁵, **וְ** **וְ** as perfect consecutive; 42¹⁰; cf. Ex 5¹⁸.
- b* Rem. Sometimes the negation is only virtually contained in the preceding sentence, e.g. in the form of a rhetorical question (Mi 6^{8f}.) or of conditions which are to be regarded as not having been fulfilled (Jb 31¹⁸); **וְ** or **אֲמַרְנָא** in such cases becomes equivalent to *nay, rather*.
- c* 2. *Exceptive* clauses, depending on another sentence, are introduced by **וְ** **אֲמַרְנָא** *except that*, and (again after negative sentences, see *a* above) **אֲמַרְנָא** **וְ**¹ *unless*; especially **אֲמַרְנָא** **וְ** with the perfect (equivalent to *unless previously*) after imperfects which contain a declaration, e.g. Gn 32²⁷ *I will not let thee go, except thou hast previously blessed me*; Lv 22⁶, Is 55¹⁰, 65⁶, Am 3⁷, Ru 3¹⁸. Finally, **אֲמַרְנָא** *unless*, Am 3⁴ (with perfect after a rhetorical question), or simply **וְ** **אֲמַרְנָא** Gn 43³ with a noun-clause, *except your brother be with you*; Is 10⁴ after a rhetorical question, with a verbal-clause.

¹ Very probably this use of **אֲמַרְנָא** **וְ** arises from the original meaning *for if, surely if* (**וְ** in an affirmative sense); so evidently in Ex 22²² as a forcible resumption of the preceding **אֲמַרְנָא**. Thus, e.g. Ju 15⁷ is simply *surely when I have been avenged of you, after that I will cease*, equivalent to, *I will not cease, until I have, &c.* When the exception follows, an ellipse must be assumed, e.g. Ru 3¹⁸ *surely (or for) when he has finished it (then the man will rest)*. It is far less natural to assume such an ellipse with **אֲמַרְנָא** **וְ** *but* (before entire clauses as before single nouns); see *a* above.

Rem. The principal statement, to which **אם כִּי** appends an exception, *d* must sometimes be supplied from the context; thus, Gn 40¹⁴ (I desire nothing else) *except that thou remember me*, equivalent to *only do thou remember*, &c. (cf. § 106 n, note 2; but it is probably better to read **אִךְ** for **כִּי**). Cf. Mi 6⁸, where **אם כִּי**, equivalent to *nothing but*, is used before an infinitive, and Jb 42⁸, equivalent to *only*, before a noun. Similarly when **אם כִּי** after an oath introduces an emphatic assurance, e.g. in 2 K 5²⁰ *as the Lord liveth* (I can do nothing else) *except I run after him*, &c.; cf. 2 S 15²¹ *Keth.*, Jer 51¹⁴, Ru 3¹² *Keth.*, and even without the oath, Ju 15⁷; cf. the Rem. on c.

§ 164. *Temporal Clauses.*

1. The relations of time existing between two different actions or *a* events are frequently expressed without the aid of a conjunction simply by juxtaposition:—

(a) Actions or events are represented as wholly or in part *simultaneous* by connecting a noun-clause with another noun-clause or verbal-clause introduced by **וְ** (or **וְהִנֵּה**), e.g. Gn 7⁶ *and Noah was six hundred years old* (prop. *a son of six hundred years*), **וְהַמָּבּוּל הָיָה** and (i.e. *when*) *the flood was*. This is especially the case when the predicate of the noun-clause (frequently introduced by **עוֹד** *still*) is expressed by an active participle, e.g. Jb 1^{16 f} **וְהָיָה כִּי יִבְרַח יוֹהָנָן בָּא וְג'** *he was yet speaking, and there came another*, &c.; see the numerous examples in § 111 g and § 116 u. Instead of a complete noun-clause there often occurs a simple *casus pendens* after **כִּלְ** with a participial attribute in the sense of *whenever any one . . .*, e.g. 1 S 2¹³ **כִּלְ־אִישׁ זִבְחָה וְזִבְחָה** *whenever any man offered sacrifice, then came*, &c.; 2 S 2²³, &c.; see the examples (in which the second member is generally introduced by *wāw apodosis*) in § 116 w.

(b) Sequence is expressed by the juxtaposition

(1) of two imperfects consecutive, e.g. Gn 24¹⁹ **וְהָיָה כִּי לִהְיוֹתָ וְהָיָה** *and when she had done giving him drink, she said*, &c.; 28^{8 f}, 29³¹, 30⁹, 32²⁶, &c.; cf. § 111 d;

(2) of a noun-clause with a passive participle as predicate, and a verbal-clause attached by **וְ**, e.g. Gn 38²⁵; cf. § 116 v; in Gn 49²⁹ an imperative follows without **וְ**;

(3) of two perfects (frequently with the secondary idea of rapid succession¹ of the two actions or events in past time), e.g. Gn 19²³ **וְהָיָה כִּי יָרָא לוֹט בָּא וְג'** *the sun was just risen . . . and (=when) Lot came*, &c., cf. 1 S 9⁵, 2 S 2²⁴; Gn 44^{3 f}, Ju 3²⁴, 15¹⁴, 20^{89 f}.—In all these examples the subject follows immediately after the connective *Wāw*, and then the (simple) perfect. On the other hand,

(4) a perfect consecutive follows another perfect consecutive to express the contingent succession of future actions, e.g. Gn 44⁴ **וְהָיָה כִּי יִבְרַח יוֹהָנָן בָּא וְג'**

¹ This secondary idea is implied here by the mere co-ordination of two independent *verbal*-clauses, just as the idea of simultaneous occurrence (according to § 116 u, note 1) is implied in the co-ordination of a *noun*-clause with another clause. In Gn 27³⁰ the immediate succession is especially emphasized by **אִךְ** and the infinitive absolute, *Jacob was yet scarce gone out . . . then Esau his brother came*; in 1 K 9²⁴ by **אִךְ** only; in ψ 48⁶ by **כִּי** and the addition of two more perfects without **וְ**.

and when thou dost overtake them (as soon as thou shalt have overtaken), thou shalt say unto them. Naturally, examples of this kind are very closely related to conditional sentences; see, therefore, the examples in § 112 *kk* and § 159 *g*. On the connexion of an imperfect consecutive or a perfect with detached expressions of time (as equivalent to complete clauses), cf. § 111 *b*; on the imperfect consecutive after וְיָהִי and a statement of time, cf. § 111 *g*; on the perfect consecutive following a detached statement of time, as in Ex 16⁶, cf. § 112 *oo*.—In 1 S 29¹⁰ an imperative with י follows the perfect consecutive.

- C (5) The fact that one action or event has not yet taken place on the occurrence of another, is expressed by תָּרָם (an adverb, not a conjunction) with the imperfect (according to § 107 *c*). The apodosis, which may consist of a subject and perfect or even of a noun-clause (Gn 24¹⁵),¹ is then connected by וְ (or וְהָיָה) as in the examples above, under no. 3, e.g. Gn 19⁴ (cf. Jos 2⁸) נָסְבוּ וְ . . . נָסְבוּ וְ . . . תָּרָם יִשְׁכְּבוּ וְאֲנִשִּׁי הָעִיר they had not yet lain down, and (= when) the men of the city . . . compassed, &c.; Gn 24²⁵.

d 2. Conjunctions used to introduce temporal clauses are כִּי (with perfect, e.g. Gn 6¹, Ju 1²⁸, 16¹⁶, 1 S 1¹²; with imperfect, Gn 4¹², 12¹², 24⁴¹, Ex 3²¹, Lv 21⁹, Dt 31²¹, Is 1¹², 8¹⁹) and אֲשֶׁר² when (כִּי with the imperfect also = *as often as*, ψ 8⁴; with perfect Jb 1⁵); less frequently אַחֵר³ (joined with a perfect), e.g. Gn 38⁹, Nu 21⁹, Ju 6³, ψ 41⁷, 94¹⁸, cf. also Is 24¹³ = *quotiescunque*; also in the same sense with an imperfect, Nu 36⁴; with a perfect, equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, Is 4⁴. Other conjunctions of time are the compounds כִּמּוֹ when, Gn 19¹⁵; כַּאֲשֶׁר when, after that; עַד-כִּי, עַד-אֲשֶׁר until (also the simple עַד, e.g. Gn 38¹¹, Jos 2²², 1 S 1²² [with the imperfect = *only when*, as in 2 S 10⁵]); 2⁵, &c.; especially in the formula עַד-בְּלֹתִי הַשְּׂאִיר לוֹ until there was none left remaining to him (where indeed it would be very natural to read הַשְּׂאִיר the infin. constr., as elsewhere after בְּלֹתִי, § 114 *s*) Nu 21³⁵, Dt 3³, Jos 8²², 11⁸ (but 1 S 14¹⁹ while, as long as); עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא before that, Ec 12^{1.2.6} with an imperfect, as in Pr 8²⁶ עַד with a perfect; עַד-אֵם, עַד-אֲשֶׁר אֵם until the time when; אַחֲרֵי-אֲשֶׁר (for which in Ez 40¹ אַחֲרֵי-אֲשֶׁר; Lv 25⁴⁸, 1 S 5⁹ simply אַחֲרֵי; Lv 14⁴³, Jer 41¹⁶, Jb 42⁷ simply אַחֲרֵי) after that; מֵאָז (prop. since that time; the dependent clause is attached to it in the same way as the attributive clause to the demonstrative אֲשֶׁר § 138 *e*) since, Gn 39⁶; בְּתָרָם (and simply תָּרָם § 107 *c*) before; קִדְמַת אֲשֶׁר (for קִדְמַת אֲשֶׁר before, ψ 129⁶.

- C Rem. 1. With regard to the tenses used with the above conjunctions, the rules are practically the same as those given in § 158 *d* for causal clauses. The perfect indicates actions completed in the past or future (in the former case corresponding to the Latin pluperfect, § 106 *f*, and in the latter to the

¹ On the perfect in the protasis, which is critically doubtful, cf. § 107 *c*.

² On אֲשֶׁר as an original demonstrative, cf. § 138 *a*; hence אֲשֶׁר נָשִׁיב is properly *up to that (moment)—we shall return*.

³ Cf. the frequent use of *wenn* [prop. *if*] for *wann* [= *when*] in German.

Latin *futurum exactum*, § 106 *o*), the imperfect denotes actions occurring contingently in the future. On בָּטָרָם, בָּטָרָם, and עַד with the imperfect as a *tempus historicum*, cf. 107 *c*.

2. Clauses introduced by עַד, עַד־כִּי, or עַד־אַשֶׁר, sometimes express a limit *f* which is not absolute (terminating the preceding action), but only relative, beyond which the action or state described in the principal clause still continues; thus, עַד with the imperfect, § 110¹; עַד־כִּי with the perfect, Gn 26¹³, with impf. 49¹⁰; עַד־אַשֶׁר with the perfect, Gn 28¹⁵; with the imperfect, § 112⁸.—Like the Arab. حَتَّى may even introduce a main clause; e.g. Ex 15¹⁶ עַד־יַעֲבֹר prop. no doubt = thus it came to this—they passed through, i.e. so they passed through.

3. The infinitive construct governed by a preposition (§ 114 *d, e*) is very *g* frequently used as the equivalent of a temporal clause; the infinitive with בְּ may usually be rendered by *when*, *as*, or *whilst*; the infinitive with בִּי by *when*, *as soon as* (in Pr 10²⁵ followed by a noun-clause introduced by *wāw apodosis*), or, when referring to the future, by *if*; the infinitive after מִן by *since*. According to § 111 *g* such statements of time are generally preceded by וַיְהִי and the apodosis follows in the imperfect consecutive; hence in 1 S 17⁵⁵ (cf. Driver on the passage) וַיִּכְרְאוּת with a simple perfect following, is unusual. On the continuation of these infinitival constructions by means of the perfect consecutive, cf. § 112 *v*, and in general, § 114 *r*.—With the participle, בֹּ appears to be used as the equivalent of a conjunction in בֹּמַשִּׁיב as he drew back, Gn 38²⁹ (unless we should read בֹּהַשִּׁיב [or בֹּמוֹ הַשִּׁיב, cf. Gn 19¹⁵]), and in בֹּפֶרֶחַת when it budded, 40¹⁰.

§ 165. Final Clauses.¹

1. Like most of the dependent clauses hitherto treated, the final *a* clause may also be joined by a simple *wāw copulative* to the main clause, unless the final clause is directly subordinated to the governing verb.

Examples of the connexion: (α) of a final imperfect (or jussive?) with a perfect by means of וַי, La 1¹⁹, see § 107 *q*; with an interrogative sentence, 2 S 9^{1,3}, Jb 38²⁴; with an optative, § 51⁹; with an imperative, 1 K 11²¹; (β) of a cohortative with an imperative by וַי, Gn 29²¹, 1 S 15¹⁶, or a jussive, Neh 2⁵ (§ 108 *d*); (γ) of a jussive with an imperative by וַי, Ex 9¹, 2 S 16¹¹, 1 K 5²⁰, § 59¹⁴, 86¹⁷; with a jussive, Jb 21¹⁹, or cohortative, § 109 *f, g* (cf. also 2 S 24²¹ the infinitive with לְ, Jon 1¹¹ מָה with the 1st plur. imperf., and 2 Ch 29¹⁰ עַם־לִבְכִי, which are equivalent to cohortatives); (δ) of an imperative with a jussive, cohortative, or interrogative sentence by וַי, § 110 *i*; (ε) of a perfect consecutive after another perfect consecutive, Lv 14³⁶; after an imperfect, § 112 *m* and *p*; similarly after a jussive, § 112 *q*; after an imperative, § 112 *r*.—On negative final clauses joined by וְלֹא to the imperfect (so Ex 28⁴³, 30²⁰; and 2 S 13²⁵ after אֶל־נָא with a jussive in the main clause) see the Rem. on § 109 *g*. In Ex 28³², 39²³ the negative final clause is simply connected by לֹא.—On the use of an historical statement after verbs of command-

¹ Cf. H. G. T. Mitchell, *Final Constructions of Biblical Hebrew*, Leipzig, 1879.

ing, where we should expect a final clause (e.g. Neh 13⁹ *then I commanded, and they cleansed*, equivalent to *that they should cleanse, and they cleansed*; in Jb 9⁷ a negative final clause is connected in this way by וְלֹא, cf. § 120 f.

For examples of the direct subordination of the final imperfect (without וְ) see § 120 c.

b 2. Final conjunctions are לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר *to the end that*; also simply לְמַעַן Gn 12¹³, 27²⁵, Ex 4⁶, ψ 51⁶, &c.; אֲשֶׁר בְּעֵבֶר prop. *for the purpose that*, Gn 27¹⁰, and simply בְּעֵבֶר Gn 27⁴, Ex 9¹⁴, 20²⁰; also the simple אֲשֶׁר¹ Dt 4^{10,40}, 6³, 32⁴⁶, Jos 3⁷, Neh 8^{14f}; negatively, אֲשֶׁר לֹא Gn 11⁷, 24³, 1 K 22¹⁶; or שֶׁ Ec 3¹⁴; also negatively, שֶׁלֹּא עַל־דְּבַרְתָּ שֶׁלֹּא *for the matter (purpose) that . . . not*, Ec 7¹⁴; לְבִלְתִּי with imperfect, Ex 20²⁰, 2 S 14¹⁴ *that . . . not*.—Quite exceptional is the use of מִן (if the text be right) in Dt 33¹¹ מִן־יְקֻמִּין, with the imperfect, equivalent to *that . . . not* [in prose, מִקֵּים].

c Rem. All the conjunctions here mentioned are naturally always used with the imperfect, see § 107 q (on the apparent exception in Jos 4²⁴, see § 74 g).—On the negative conjunctions אֵל and כִּין *that not, lest*, see § 152 f and w. On the infinitive with לְ (also לְמַעַן Gn 18¹⁹, 37²², &c.) as the equivalent of a final clause (Gn 11⁵, 28⁴, &c.), see § 114 f, h, p. On the continuation of such infinitival constructions by means of the finite verb, see § 114 r. On the negation of the final infinitive by לְבִלְתִּי, § 114 s. On the preposition מִן with a substantive or infinitive as the equivalent of a negative final clause (Gn 31²⁹, 1 S 15²³, &c.), see § 119 x and y.

§ 166. Consecutive Clauses.

a 1. Consecutive clauses are added by means of simple wāw copulative with the jussive,³ especially after negative and interrogative sentences, e.g. Nu 23¹⁹ וַיֹּכַח וַיִּתְּנָהּ לֹא אִישׁ אֵל וַיִּכְזֹּב וַיִּבְרָא אָדָם וַיִּתְּנָהּ *God is not a man, that he should lie, and (i. e. neither) the son of man, that he should repent*; Is 53² וַיִּנְחָמֶהוּ; Ho 14¹⁰ מִי חָכֵם וַיְבִין אֵלָה נְבוֹן וַיִּדְעֵם *who is wise, that he may understand these things? prudent, that he may know them?* Jb 5¹² וְלֹא=*so that . . . not*; in Pr 30³ וְ is separated from the predicate by the object. In Gn 16¹⁰ a negative consecutive clause comes after a cohortative, and in Ex 10⁵ after a perfect consecutive.—On the other hand, in Jb 9^{32,33} the jussive in the sense of a consecutive clause is attached without Wāw to the preceding negative sentence (in

¹ In Ez 36²⁷ a final clause is introduced by אֲשֶׁר אֵת, thus at the same time taking the form of an object-clause.

² On לְ as a supposed conjunction (equivalent to the Arabic *li*) 1 K 6¹⁹, see § 66 i.

³ That such examples as וַיִּכְזֹּב are to be regarded as jussive is probable from the analogy of Ho 14¹⁰ and Jb 9³³.

verse 32 a second jussive follows, likewise without *Wāw*, for he is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, that we should come together in judgement). On the imperfect consecutive as expressing a logical consequence, see § 111 l; on the perfect consecutive as a consecutive clause after a participle, see § 112 n.

2. Conjunctions introducing consecutive clauses are again (see b § 157 c, note 3) וְ and וְכֵן = *so that*; especially again after interrogative sentences, according to § 107 u; cf. Nu 16¹¹, וְ with the imperfect, *that ye murmur*; but in Gn 20¹⁰ with the perfect, in reference to an action already completed. On וְכֵן with the imperfect (or jussive) equivalent to *so that*, cf. further Gn 13¹⁶, 22¹⁴; with perfect and imperfect, 1 K 3^{12f}, with the demonstrative force clearly discernible, depending on הֵן; on הֵן וְכֵן = *ut non*, cf. Dt 28³⁵, 1 K 3⁸, 2 K 9⁸⁷.

On וְ with a substantive or infinitive as the equivalent of a consecutive clause, see § 119 y.

§ 167. *Aposiopesis, Anacoluthon, Involved Series of Sentences.*

1. *Aposiopesis* is the concealment or suppression of entire sentences *a* or clauses, which are of themselves necessary to complete the sense,¹ and therefore must be supplied from the context. This is especially frequent after conditional clauses; besides the examples already given in § 159 dd, cf. also Ex 32³² (the LXX and Samaritan supply אֲשֶׁר); Nu 5²⁰, Ju 9¹⁶ (in verse 19, after a long parenthesis, an imperative follows as the apodosis to this conditional clause); 1 S 12^{14f}, 2 S 5⁸ (where indeed the text is probably very corrupt; cf. the addition in 1 Ch 11⁶); 2 S 23¹⁷, ψ 27¹³, 1 Ch 4¹⁰. For other examples of various kinds, see § 117 l, and especially § 147; in Aramaic, Dn 3¹⁵.—On Gn 3²², cf. § 152 w at the end.

2. *Anacoluthon* is the change from a construction which has been *b* already begun to one of a different kind. It is found especially after long parentheses, because the speaker has either lost sight of the beginning of his sentence, or for the sake of clearness purposely makes a new beginning; thus Gn 20¹³, 31⁵² and Ez 34¹⁰ (cf. § 149 at the end); Nu 14^{21ff}, 32^{20ff}, Dt 17^{2ff}, 24^{1ff}, 29^{21ff}, Ju 10¹¹ (where, after a series of intermediate sentences, the predicate *I saved you* is sup-

¹ But those cases are not to be regarded as examples of aposiopesis, in which the answer, being closely connected with the question, is given simply in the infinitive with הֵן; cf. § 147 a, note 1.

pressed; but the text can hardly be correct); perhaps also Is 66¹⁸ (cf., however, Delitzsch on the passage, which is certainly corrupt).¹ On Gn 23¹³ (יִלְדָּה with the imperative), see § 110 e.

c 3. We may mention as instructive examples of *involved series* of sentences Gn 24¹⁴ and 42^π, and Gn 28^{6π}.

¹ On the other hand, from the Semitic point of view the various kinds of compound sentences are *not* to be regarded as instances of anacoluthon, e.g. Gn 17^{14.17}, nor even Gn 31⁴⁰ (cf. § 143).

THE PARADIGMS.

IN the paradigms of the verbs, those forms which are to be especially noticed by the beginner are marked throughout by an asterisk as model forms. Thus e.g. in the strong verb the 3rd *sing. fem.* קָטְלָהּ is the model for קָטְלִי, which likewise has only a vocalic affirmative, and קָטְלָהּ is the model for קָטְלָהּ, קָטְלָתִי and קָטְלָנִי, which in the same way have a toneless affirmative beginning with a consonant. On the other hand, the forms קָטְלָהֶם and קָטְלָהֶן, where the affix beginning with a consonant has the tone, stand by themselves.—In the table of the pronouns the asterisk has a different meaning; see the footnote there.—The bracketed forms (from Paradigm G onwards) are merely analogous formations not occurring in the Old Testament.

The newly added paradigm (Q) consists of forms actually found, belonging to various verbs.

A. The Personal

Nominative of the Pronoun,
or *Pronomen separatum*.

Accusative of the Pronoun,

A.

Simple form.

Sing. I. comm. אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי;
אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי I.

אֲנִי; אֲנִי; אֲנִי me.

2. { m. אַתָּה (את), in pause
אַתָּה } thou.
f. אַתְּ (אתְּ)

אַתָּה; אַתָּה, in pause אַתָּה, }
אַתָּה } thee.
אַתָּה; אַתָּה; אַתָּה, אַתָּה

3. { m. הוּא he.
f. הִיא she.

הוּא; הוּא (ה), הוּא him.

הִיא; הִיא; הִיא her (eam).

Plur. I. comm. אֲנִיחֵנוּ (נִחֵנוּ), in
pause אֲנִיחֵנוּ (נִחֵנוּ) we.

אֲנִי; אֲנִי; אֲנִי us.

2. { m. אַתֶּם
f. אַתֶּנּוּ, אַתֶּנּוּ } you.

אַתֶּם; אַתֶּם }
[אַתֶּם; אַתֶּם] you.

3. { m. הֵם, הֵם }
f. הֵנּוּ } they.

(הֵם), הֵם; הֵם, הֵם, הֵם *; הֵם,
(הֵם), הֵם * them (eos).

[הֵם], הֵם; הֵם, (הֵם); [הֵם] them (eas).

Pronoun.¹

or *Suffixum Verbi*.

Genitive of the Pronoun, or *Suffixum Nominis*
(*Pron. possessivum*).

B.	A.	B.
With <i>Nûn energicum</i> .	Attached to a sing. noun.	Attached to a noun plur. or dual.
נִיְּ; נִיְּ	יְּ my (prop. gen. mei).	יְּ my.
נִיְּ, (נִיְּ)	נִיְּ, נִיְּ, in } thy pause נִיְּ } (prop. נִיְּ, נִיְּ, (נִיְּ) } tui).	נִיְּ } נִיְּ } thy.
not found.		
(נִיְּ), נִיְּ; (נִיְּ)	נִיְּ; נִיְּ; נִיְּ, יְּ (נִיְּ) his (eius and suus).	נִיְּ, נִיְּ, (נִיְּ *) his.
נִיְּ	נִיְּ; נִיְּ; נִיְּ her.	נִיְּ her.
נִיְּ? (see § 58 k)	נִיְּ; נִיְּ; (נִיְּ) our.	נִיְּ our.
these forms are not found.	נִיְּ; נִיְּ } נִיְּ; נִיְּ } your.	נִיְּ } נִיְּ } your.
	נִיְּ; נִיְּ, } נִיְּ * } their. נִיְּ, נִיְּ, נִיְּ }	נִיְּ, נִיְּ * } נִיְּ } their.

¹ Forms with an asterisk are exclusively poetic, those in parentheses () are rare, those in brackets [] do not occur (cf. § 58 a, note).

		Qal.			Niph'al.	Pi'el.	
Perf. Sing.	3. m.	*קָטַל	*כָּבַד	*קָטַן	*נִקְטַל	*קָטַל, קָטַל	
	3. f.	*קָטְלָה	*כָּבְדָה	*קָטְנָה	*נִקְטְלָה	*קָטְלָה	
	2. m.	*קָטַלְתָּ	*כָּבַדְתָּ	*קָטַנְתָּ	*נִקְטַלְתָּ	*קָטַלְתָּ	
	2. f.	*קָטַלְתְּ	*כָּבַדְתְּ	*קָטַנְתְּ	*נִקְטַלְתְּ	*קָטַלְתְּ	
	1. c.	קָטַלְתִּי	כָּבַדְתִּי	קָטַנְתִּי	נִקְטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתִּי	
	Plur.	3. c.	קָטְלוּ	כָּבְדוּ	קָטְנוּ	נִקְטְלוּ	קָטְלוּ
		2. m.	*קָטַלְתֶּם	*כָּבַדְתֶּם	*קָטַנְתֶּם	*נִקְטַלְתֶּם	*קָטַלְתֶּם
		2. f.	קָטַלְתֶּן	כָּבַדְתֶּן	קָטַנְתֶּן	נִקְטַלְתֶּן	קָטַלְתֶּן
		1. c.	קָטַלְנוּ	כָּבַדְנוּ	קָטַנְנוּ	נִקְטַלְנוּ	קָטַלְנוּ
Inf.		שָׁכַב, קָטַל			*הִקְטַל	*קָטַל	
Inf. absol.		קָטוּל			*הִקְטוּל, נִקְטַל	*קָטַל, קָטַל	
Imp. Sing.	2. m.	*קָטַל	*כָּבַד		*הִקְטַל	*קָטַל	
	2. f.	*קָטְלִי	*כָּבְדִי		*הִקְטְלִי	*קָטְלִי	
	Plur.	2. m.	קָטְלוּ	כָּבְדוּ		הִקְטְלוּ	קָטְלוּ
		2. f.	*קָטְלֶנָה	*כָּבְדֶנָה		*הִקְטְלֶנָה	*קָטְלֶנָה
Impf. Sing.	3. m.	*יִקְטַל	*יִכְבֹּד	*יִקְטַן	*יִקְטַל	*יִקְטַל	
	3. f.	תִּקְטַל	תִּכְבֹּד		תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטַל	
	2. m.	תִּקְטַל	תִּכְבֹּד		תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטַל	
	2. f.	*תִּקְטְלִי	*תִּכְבְּדִי		*תִּקְטְלִי	*תִּקְטְלִי	
	1. c.	אֶקְטַל	אֶכְבֹּד		אֶקְטַל	אֶקְטַל	
	Plur.	3. m.	יִקְטְלוּ	יִכְבְּדוּ		יִקְטְלוּ	יִקְטְלוּ
		3. f.	*תִּקְטְלֶנָה	*תִּכְבְּדֶנָה		*תִּקְטְלֶנָה	*תִּקְטְלֶנָה
		2. m.	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּכְבְּדוּ		תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּקְטְלוּ
		2. f.	תִּקְטְלֶנָה	תִּכְבְּדֶנָה		תִּקְטְלֶנָה	תִּקְטְלֶנָה
		1. c.	נִקְטַל	נִכְבֹּד		נִקְטַל	נִקְטַל

Shortened Impf. (Jussive).

Part. act.	קָטַל*	כָּבַד	קָטַן	נִקְטַל*	מִקְטַל*
pass.	קָטוּל*				

Verb.

<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
קָטַל*	הִקְטִיל*	הִקְטַל*	הִתְקַטַּל*
קָטַלָּה*	הִקְטִילָּה*	הִקְטַלָּה*	הִתְקַטַּלָּה*
קָטַלְתָּ*	הִקְטַלְתָּ*	הִקְטַלְתָּ*	הִתְקַטַּלְתָּ*
קָטַלְתָּ	הִקְטַלְתָּ	הִקְטַלְתָּ	הִתְקַטַּלְתָּ
קָטַלְתִּי	הִקְטַלְתִּי	הִקְטַלְתִּי	הִתְקַטַּלְתִּי
קָטַלוּ	הִקְטִילוּ	הִקְטַלוּ	הִתְקַטַּלוּ
קָטַלְתֶּם	הִקְטַלְתֶּם	הִקְטַלְתֶּם	הִתְקַטַּלְתֶּם
קָטַלְתֶּן	הִקְטַלְתֶּן	הִקְטַלְתֶּן	הִתְקַטַּלְתֶּן
קָטַלְנוּ	הִקְטַלְנוּ	הִקְטַלְנוּ	הִתְקַטַּלְנוּ
wanting.	הִקְטִיל*	wanting.	הִתְקַטַּל*
קָטַל*	הִקְטַל*	הִקְטַל*	הִתְקַטַּל*
wanting.	הִקְטַל*	wanting.	הִתְקַטַּל*
	הִקְטִילִי*		הִתְקַטַּלִי*
	הִקְטִילוּ		הִתְקַטַּלוּ
	הִקְטַלְנָה*		הִתְקַטַּלְנָה*
יִקְטַל*	יִקְטִיל*	יִקְטַל*	יִתְקַטַּל*
תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטִיל	תִּקְטַל	תִּתְקַטַּל
תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטִיל	תִּקְטַל	תִּתְקַטַּל
יִתְקַטַּל*	יִתְקַטַּלִי*	יִתְקַטַּלִי*	יִתְקַטַּלִי*
אִקְטַל	אִקְטִיל	אִקְטַל	אִתְקַטַּל
יִקְטַלוּ	יִקְטִילוּ	יִקְטַלוּ	יִתְקַטַּלוּ
תִּתְקַטַּלְנָה*	תִּתְקַטַּלְנָה*	תִּתְקַטַּלְנָה*	תִּתְקַטַּלְנָה*
תִּקְטַלוּ	תִּקְטִילוּ	תִּקְטַלוּ	תִּתְקַטַּלוּ
תִּקְטַלְנָה	תִּקְטַלְנָה	תִּקְטַלְנָה	תִּתְקַטַּלְנָה
נִקְטַל	נִקְטִיל	נִקְטַל	נִתְקַטַּל
	יִקְטַל*		
	מִקְטִיל*		מִתְקַטַּל*
מִקְטַל*		מִקְטַל*	

C. Strong Verb

		Suffixes	1 Sing.	2 Sing. m.	3 Sing. f.	3 Sing. m.
Perf. Qal	3. m.		{ קָטַלְנִי שָׁכַחְנִי }	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלָּהּ	{ קָטַלְהוּ קָטַלּוּ }
	3. f.		קָטַלְתִּנִּי	קָטַלְתְּךָ	קָטַלְתְּהָ	{ קָטַלְתֶּהּ קָטַלְתֶּהָ }
	2. m.		קָטַלְתִּנִּי	—	—	{ קָטַלְתֶּהּ קָטַלְתֶּהּ }
	2. f.		קָטַלְתִּנִּי	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּהּ
	1. c.		—	קָטַלְתִּיךָ	קָטַלְתִּיךָ	{ קָטַלְתִּי קָטַלְתִּי }
	Plur. 3. c.		קָטַלְנִי	{ קָטַלְתֶּךָ אָהַבְתֶּךָ }	קָטַלְתֶּךָ	קָטַלְתֶּהּ
	2. m.		קָטַלְתִּנִּי	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּהּ
	1. c.		—	קָטַלְתֶּךָ	קָטַלְתֶּךָ	קָטַלְתֶּהּ
Inf. Qal			{ קָטַלְי קָטַלְנִי }	{ בָּחַבְךָ קָטַלְךָ }	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלּוּ
Imp. Qal 2.			קָטַלְנִי	—	—	קָטַלְהוּ
		(from an Imperf. in a שָׁכַחְנִי, שָׁמַעְנִי)				
Imperf. Qal	3. m.		{ יִקְטַלְנִי יִלְבַּשְׁנִי }	{ יִקְטַלְךָ יִלְבַּשְׁךָ }	{ יִקְטַלָּהּ יִלְבַּשְׁהָ }	{ יִקְטַלְהוּ יִלְבַּשְׁהוּ }
	3. m.	with <i>Nûn</i> energ. }	יִקְטַלְנִי	יִקְטַלְךָ	—	יִקְטַלְנָה
	Plur. 3. m.		יִקְטַלְנִי	יִקְטַלְתֶּךָ	יִקְטַלְתֶּךָ	{ יִקְטַלְתֶּהּ יִנְאָלְתֶּהּ }
	3. m.		יִקְטַלְנִי	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלָּהּ	קָטַלּוּ

with Suffixes.

3 Sing. f.	1 Plur.	2 Plur. m.	■ Plur. f.	3 Plur. m.	3 Plur. f.
קָטְלָהּ	קָטְלָנוּ	wanting.	wanting.	{ קָטְלָם לְבָשָׁם }	קָטְלוּ
קָטְלָתָהּ	קָטְלָתָנוּ	—	—	קָטְלָתָם	wanting.
קָטְלָתֶהּ	קָטְלָתֶנוּ	—	—	קָטְלָתָם	wanting.
קָטְלָתֶיהָ	קָטְלָתֶינוּ	—	—	קָטְלָתֵיהֶם	wanting.
קָטְלָתֶיהָ	—	קָטְלָתֵיכֶם	wanting.	קָטְלָתֵיהֶם	קָטְלָתֵינוּ
קָטְלָהּ	קָטְלָנוּ	wanting.	wanting.	קָטְלוּם	קָטְלוּ
wanting.	קָטְלָתֶנוּ	—	—	wanting.	wanting.
קָטְלָנָהּ	—	קָטְלָנוֹכֶם	wanting.	קָטְלָנוֹם	wanting.
קָטְלָהּ	קָטְלָנוּ	{ בָּתְבָכֶם קָטְלָכֶם }	wanting.	קָטְלָם	קָטְלוּ
{ קָטְלָתָהּ קָטְלָהּ }	קָטְלָנוּ	—	—	קָטְלָם	—
{ יִקְטְלָהּ יִלְבָּשֶׁהָ יִקְטְלָהּ }	{ יִקְטְלָנוּ יִלְבָּשֶׁנוּ }	יִקְטְלָכֶם	wanting.	יִקְטְלָם	wanting.
יִקְטְלָנָהּ	יִקְטְלָנוּ	—	—	—	—
יִקְטְלָהּ	יִקְטְלָנוּ	יִקְטְלָיֶכֶם	wanting.	יִקְטְלָוֶם	wanting.
קָטְלָהּ	קָטְלָנוּ	wanting.	wanting.	קָטְלָם	קָטְלוּ

D. Verbs primae gutturalis

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	עָמַד	*נָעַמַד	*הָעָמַד	*הָעָמַד
3. <i>f.</i>	עָמְדָה	*נָעַמְדָה	הָעָמְדָה	*הָעָמְדָה
2. <i>m.</i>	עָמַדְתָּ	נָעַמַדְתָּ	הָעָמַדְתָּ	הָעָמַדְתָּ
2. <i>f.</i>	עָמַדְתְּ	נָעַמַדְתְּ	הָעָמַדְתְּ	הָעָמַדְתְּ
1. <i>c.</i>	עָמַדְתִּי	נָעַמַדְתִּי	הָעָמַדְתִּי	הָעָמַדְתִּי
<i>Plur. 3. c.</i>	עָמְדוּ	נָעַמְדוּ	הָעָמְדוּ	הָעָמְדוּ
2. <i>m.</i>	*עָמַדְתֶּם	נָעַמַדְתֶּם	הָעָמַדְתֶּם	הָעָמַדְתֶּם
2. <i>f.</i>	*עָמַדְתֶּן	נָעַמַדְתֶּן	הָעָמַדְתֶּן	הָעָמַדְתֶּן
1. <i>c.</i>	עָמַדְנוּ	נָעַמַדְנוּ	הָעָמַדְנוּ	הָעָמַדְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	*עָמַד	*הָעָמַד	*הָעָמַד	
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	עָמַד	*נָעַמַד, הָאָסַף	*הָעָמַד	*הָעָמַד
<i>Imp. Sing. m.</i>	*עָמַד	*חָזַק	*הָעָמַד	הָעָמַד
<i>f.</i>	עָמְדִי	חָזְקִי	הָעָמְדִי	הָעָמְדִי
<i>Plur. m.</i>	עָמְדוּ	חָזְקוּ	הָעָמְדוּ	הָעָמְדוּ
<i>f.</i>	*עָמַדְנָה	*חָזְקְנָה	הָעָמַדְנָה	הָעָמַדְנָה
<i>Impf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	*יָעַמַד	*יִחַזַּק	*יָעַמַד	*יָעַמַד
3. <i>f.</i>	תָּעַמַד	תִּחַזַּק	תָּעַמַד	תָּעַמַד
2. <i>m.</i>	תָּעַמַד	תִּחַזַּק	תָּעַמַד	תָּעַמַד
2. <i>f.</i>	*תָּעַמְדִי	*תִּחַזְּקִי	תָּעַמְדִי	תָּעַמְדִי
1. <i>c.</i>	*אָעַמַד	אִחַזַּק	אָעַמַד	אָעַמַד
<i>Plur. 3. m.</i>	*יָעַמְדוּ	*יִחַזְּקוּ	יָעַמְדוּ	יָעַמְדוּ
3. <i>f.</i>	תָּעַמְדְנָה	תִּחַזְּקְנָה	תָּעַמְדְנָה	תָּעַמְדְנָה
2. <i>m.</i>	תָּעַמְדוּ	תִּחַזְּקוּ	תָּעַמְדוּ	תָּעַמְדוּ
2. <i>f.</i>	תָּעַמְדְנָה	תִּחַזְּקְנָה	תָּעַמְדְנָה	תָּעַמְדְנָה
1. <i>c.</i>	נָעַמַד	נִחַזַּק	נָעַמַד	נָעַמַד
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			יָעַמַד	
<i>Part. act.</i>	עָמַד	*נָעַמַד	*מָעַמַד	
<i>pass.</i>	עָמְדָה			מָעַמַד

E. Verbs mediae gutturalis.

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Pi'el.</i>	<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	שָׁחַט	נִשְׁחַט	בָּרַךְ*	בָּרַךְ*	הִתְבָּרַךְ*
3. f.	שָׁחַטָה*	נִשְׁחַטָה*	בָּרַכָה	[בָּרַכָה]	הִתְבָּרַכָה
2. m.	שָׁחַטְתָּ	נִשְׁחַטְתָּ	בָּרַכְתָּ	בָּרַכְתָּ	הִתְבָּרַכְתָּ
2. f.	שָׁחַטְתָּ	נִשְׁחַטְתָּ	בָּרַכְתָּ	בָּרַכְתָּ	הִתְבָּרַכְתָּ
1. c.	שָׁחַטְתִּי	נִשְׁחַטְתִּי	בָּרַכְתִּי	בָּרַכְתִּי	הִתְבָּרַכְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.	שָׁחַטוּ*	נִשְׁחַטוּ*	בָּרְכוּ	בָּרְכוּ	הִתְבָּרְכוּ
2. m.	שָׁחַטְתֶּם	נִשְׁחַטְתֶּם	בָּרַכְתֶּם	בָּרַכְתֶּם	הִתְבָּרַכְתֶּם
2. f.	שָׁחַטְתֶּן	נִשְׁחַטְתֶּן	[בָּרַכְתֶּן]	בָּרַכְתֶּן	הִתְבָּרַכְתֶּן
1. c.	שָׁחַטְנוּ	נִשְׁחַטְנוּ	בָּרַכְנוּ	בָּרַכְנוּ	הִתְבָּרַכְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	שָׁחֹט	הִשְׁחַט	בָּרַךְ*	wanting.	הִתְבָּרַךְ*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	שָׁחוֹט	נִשְׁחוֹט	בָּרַךְ*		
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	שָׁחַט*	הִשְׁחַט	בָּרַךְ*		הִתְבָּרַךְ*
f.	שָׁחַטִי*	הִשְׁחַטִי*	בָּרְכִי*	wanting.	[הִתְבָּרְכִי]
<i>Plur.</i> m.	שָׁחַטוּ	הִשְׁחַטוּ	בָּרְכוּ		[הִתְבָּרְכוּ]
f.	שָׁחַטְנָה	הִשְׁחַטְנָה	בָּרַכְנָה*		הִתְבָּרַכְנָה
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יִשְׁחַט*	יִשְׁחַט	יִבְרַךְ*	יִבְרַךְ*	יִתְבָּרַךְ*
3. f.	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּבְרַךְ	תִּבְרַךְ	תִּתְבָּרַךְ
2. m.	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּבְרַךְ	תִּבְרַךְ	תִּתְבָּרַךְ
2. f.	תִּשְׁחַטִי*	תִּשְׁחַטִי*	תִּבְרַכִּי	[תִּבְרַכִּי]	[תִּתְבְּרַכִּי]
1. c.	אִשְׁחַט	אִשְׁחַט	אִבְרַךְ	אִבְרַךְ	אִתְבָּרַךְ
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יִשְׁחַטוּ	יִשְׁחַטוּ	יִבְרְכוּ	יִבְרְכוּ	יִתְבָּרְכוּ
3. f.	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּבְרַכְנָה	תִּבְרַכְנָה	תִּתְבָּרַכְנָה
2. m.	תִּשְׁחַטוּ	תִּשְׁחַטוּ	תִּבְרְכוּ	תִּבְרְכוּ	תִּתְבָּרְכוּ
2. f.	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּבְרַכְנָה	תִּבְרַכְנָה	תִּתְבָּרַכְנָה
1. c.	נִשְׁחַט	נִשְׁחַט	נִבְרַךְ	נִבְרַךְ	נִתְבָּרַךְ
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִשְׁחַטְהוּ				
<i>Part. act.</i>	שֹׁחֵט	נִשְׁחָט	מְבָרַךְ*		מִתְבָּרַךְ*
<i>pass.</i>	שָׁחוֹט			מְבָרַךְ*	

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Piel.
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	שָׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	שִׁלַּח*
3. f.	שָׁלְחָה	נִשְׁלַחָה	שִׁלְחָה
2. m.	שָׁלַחְתָּ	נִשְׁלַחְתָּ	שִׁלַּחְתָּ
2. f.	שָׁלַחְתָּ*	נִשְׁלַחְתָּ*	שִׁלַּחְתָּ*
1. c.	שָׁלַחְתִּי	נִשְׁלַחְתִּי	שִׁלַּחְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.	שָׁלְחוּ	נִשְׁלְחוּ	שִׁלְחוּ
2. m.	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	שִׁלַּחְתֶּם
2. f.	שָׁלַחְתֶּן	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּן	שִׁלַּחְתֶּן
1. c.	שָׁלַחְנוּ	נִשְׁלַחְנוּ	שִׁלַּחְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	שָׁלַח*	הִשְׁלַח*	שִׁלַּח*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	שֹׁלַח	נִשְׁלֹחַ	שִׁלַּח
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	שָׁלַח*	הִשְׁלַח*	שִׁלַּח*
f.	שִׁלְחִי	הִשְׁלְחִי	שִׁלְחִי*
<i>Plur.</i> m.	שָׁלְחוּ	הִשְׁלְחוּ	שִׁלְחוּ
f.	שִׁלְחֶנָּה*	הִשְׁלְחֶנָּה	שִׁלְחֶנָּה*
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יִשְׁלַח*	יִשְׁלַח*	יִשְׁלַח*
3. f.	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח*
2. m.	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח
2. f.	תִּשְׁלַחִי	תִּשְׁלַחִי	תִּשְׁלַחִי
1. c.	אִשְׁלַח	אִשְׁלַח	אִשְׁלַח
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יִשְׁלְחוּ	יִשְׁלְחוּ	יִשְׁלְחוּ
3. f.	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*
2. m.	תִּשְׁלְחוּ	תִּשְׁלְחוּ	תִּשְׁלְחוּ
2. f.	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה
1. c.	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִשְׁלַחֲנִי		
<i>Part. act.</i>	שֹׁלֵחַ*	נִשְׁלֹחַ	מִשְׁלֵחַ*
<i>pass.</i>	שֹׁלֵחַ*		

tertiaе gutturalis.

<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
שָׁלַח	*הִשְׁלִיחַ	הִשְׁלַח	*הִשְׁתַּלַּח
שִׁלְחָהּ	הִשְׁלִיחָהּ	הִשְׁלַחָהּ	הִשְׁתַּלַּחָהּ
שִׁלְחָתָּהּ	הִשְׁלִיחָתָּהּ	הִשְׁלַחָתָּהּ	הִשְׁתַּלַּחָתָּהּ
*שִׁלְחָתָּהּ	*הִשְׁלִיחָתָּהּ	*הִשְׁלַחָתָּהּ	*הִשְׁתַּלַּחָתָּהּ
שִׁלְחָתִי	הִשְׁלִיחָתִי	הִשְׁלַחָתִי	הִשְׁתַּלַּחָתִי
שִׁלְחוּ	הִשְׁלִיחוּ	הִשְׁלַחוּ	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
שִׁלְחוּם	הִשְׁלִיחוּם	הִשְׁלַחוּם	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּם
שִׁלְחוּן	הִשְׁלִיחוּן	הִשְׁלַחוּן	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּן
שִׁלְחוּנִי	הִשְׁלִיחוּנִי	הִשְׁלַחוּנִי	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּנִי
	*הִשְׁלִיחַ		*הִשְׁתַּלַּח
	*הִשְׁלַח	*הִשְׁלַח	
	הִשְׁלַח		*הִשְׁתַּלַּח
	הִשְׁלִיחִי		הִשְׁתַּלַּחִי
wanting.	הִשְׁלִיחוּ	wanting.	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
	הִשְׁלַחְנָה		*הִשְׁתַּלַּחְנָה
יִשְׁלַח	*יִשְׁלִיחַ	יִשְׁלַח	יִשְׁתַּלַּח
תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלִיחַ	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁתַּלַּח
הִשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלִיחַ	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁתַּלַּח
הִשְׁלִיחִי	תִּשְׁלִיחִי	תִּשְׁלַחִי	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחִי
אִשְׁלַח	אִשְׁלִיחַ	אִשְׁלַח	אִשְׁתַּלַּח
יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁלִיחוּ	יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
הִשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	*תִּשְׁתַּלַּחְנָה
תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁלִיחוּ	תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחְנָה
נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלִיחַ	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁתַּלַּח
	יִשְׁלַח		
	*מִשְׁלִיחַ		*מִשְׁתַּלַּח
מִשְׁלַח		מִשְׁלַח	

G. Verbs *mediae geminatae*

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	קָבַב, תָּם	נָסַב, נָסַם*
3. <i>f.</i>	קָבְּבָה, תָּמָה	נָסְבָה*
2. <i>m.</i>	קָבַוְתָ*	נָסְבוֹתָ*
2. <i>f.</i>	קָבוֹת	נָסְבוֹת
1. <i>c.</i>	קָבוֹתִי	נָסְבוֹתִי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>c.</i>	קָבְּבוּ, תָּמוּ	נָסְבוּ
2. <i>m.</i>	קָבוֹתֶם	נָסְבוֹתֶם
2. <i>f.</i>	קָבוֹתֵן	נָסְבוֹתֵן
1. <i>c.</i>	קָבוֹנוּ	נָסְבוֹנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	סָב*	הִסָּב*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	קָבוֹב	הִמָּס, הִסּוֹב
<i>Imp. Sing. m.</i>	סָב*	הִסָּב
<i>f.</i>	סָבִי*	הִסָּבִי*
<i>Plur. m.</i>	סָבוּ	הִסָּבוּ
<i>f.</i>	[סָבִינָה]	[הִסָּבִינָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יָסַב* (יָסַל § 67 p)	יָסַם*
3. <i>f.</i>	תָּסַב	תָּסַם
2. <i>m.</i>	תָּסַב	תָּסַם
2. <i>f.</i>	תָּסַבִּי*	תָּסַבִּי*
1. <i>c.</i>	אָסַב	אָסַם
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יָסְבוּ	יָסְמוּ
3. <i>f.</i>	תָּסַבִּינָה*	[תָּסַבִּינָה]
2. <i>m.</i>	תָּסְבוּ	תָּסְמוּ
2. <i>f.</i>	[תָּסַבִּינָה]	[תָּסַבִּינָה]
1. <i>c.</i>	נָסַב	נָסַם
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>	וַיָּסַב* (pause וַיָּסַב)	
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יָסַבִּי*	
<i>Part. act.</i>	סָבֵב	נָסֵב
<i>pass.</i>	סָבוֹב*	(fem. נָסְבָה)

or double v.

<i>Hiph'al.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Po'el.</i>	<i>Po'al.</i>
הִסָּב, הִסָּב*	הִסָּב*	סִוֵּבב*	סִוֵּבב*
הִסָּבָה*	הִסָּבָה	סִוֵּבְכָה	[סִוֵּבְכָה]
הִסָּבֹת*	[הִסָּבֹת]	סִוֵּבְכָת	סִוֵּבְכָת
הִסָּבוֹת	הִסָּבוֹת	סִוֵּבְכָת	סִוֵּבְכָת
הִסָּבֹתִי	[הִסָּבֹתִי]	סִוֵּבְכָתִי	סִוֵּבְכָתִי
הִסָּבִי, הִחֲלִי	הִסָּבִי	סִוֵּבְבִי	סִוֵּבְבִי
הִסָּבוֹתֶם	[הִסָּבוֹתֶם]	סִוֵּבְכֶם	סִוֵּבְכֶם
הִסָּבוֹתָן	הִסָּבוֹתָן	סִוֵּבְכֶנּוּ	סִוֵּבְכֶנּוּ
הִסָּבוֹנִי	[הִסָּבוֹנִי]	סִוֵּבְנִי	[סִוֵּבְנִי]
הִסָּב		סִוֵּב	
הִסָּב	הִשָּׁמָה	סִוֵּב	[סִוֵּב]
הִסָּב*		סִוֵּב	
הִסָּבִי	wanting.	[סִוֵּבְכִי]	wanting.
הִסָּבִי		סִוֵּבְכִי	
[הִסָּבִינָה]		סִוֵּבְכִינָה	
יִסָּב, יִסָּב*	יִסָּב, יִסָּב*	יִסֵּבב	[יִסֵּבב]
יִסָּב	[יִסָּב]	יִסֵּבְב	יִסֵּבְב
יִסָּב	יִסָּב	יִסֵּבְב	יִסֵּבְב
[יִסָּבִי]	יִסָּבִי*	[יִסֵּבְכִי]	יִסֵּבְכִי
יִסָּב	[יִסָּב]	יִסֵּבְכִי	יִסֵּבְכִי
יִסָּבִי, יִסָּבִי	יִסָּבִי	יִסֵּבְכִי	יִסֵּבְכִי
יִסָּבִינָה*	יִסָּבִינָה*	[יִסֵּבְכִינָה]	יִסֵּבְכִינָה
יִסָּבִי	יִסָּבִי	יִסֵּבְכִי	יִסֵּבְכִי
יִסָּבִינָה	יִסָּבִינָה	[יִסֵּבְכִינָה]	יִסֵּבְכִינָה
יִסָּב	[יִסָּב]	יִסֵּבְכִי	[יִסֵּבְכִי]
יִסָּב		יִסֵּב	
יִסָּב		יִסֵּב	
יִסָּבִי (יִסָּבְכִי)		יִסֵּבְכִי	
יִסָּב*		יִסֵּבְכִי	
	יִסָּב		יִסֵּבְכִי

H. Verbs י"ב.

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'il.	Hoph'al.
<i>Perf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	נָפַל [נָפַשׁ]	נָפַשׁ*	הִנָּשׁ*	הִנָּשׁ*
3. f.		נָפְשָׁה	הִנָּשָׁה	הִנָּשָׁה
2. m.		נָפַשְׁתָּ	הִנָּשַׁתָּ	הִנָּשַׁתָּ
2. f.		נָפַשְׁתְּ	הִנָּשַׁתְּ	הִנָּשַׁתְּ
1. c.	regular.	נָפַשְׁתִּי	הִנָּשַׁתִּי	הִנָּשַׁתִּי
<i>Plur. 3. c.</i>		נָפְשׁוּ	הִנָּשׁוּ	הִנָּשׁוּ
2. m.		נָפַשְׁתֶּם	הִנָּשַׁתֶּם	הִנָּשַׁתֶּם
2. f.		נָפַשְׁתֶּן	הִנָּשַׁתֶּן	הִנָּשַׁתֶּן
1. c.		נָפַשְׁנוּ	הִנָּשַׁנוּ	הִנָּשַׁנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	נָפַשְׁתָּ*	נָפַל*	הִנָּשׁ	הִנָּשׁ*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	נָפַשׁ	נָפַל	הִנָּשׁ, הִנָּשָׁה	הִנָּשׁ*
<i>Imp. Sing. m.</i>	נָפַשׁ*	נָפַל*	הִנָּשׁ	הִנָּשׁ*
f.	נָפְשִׁי	נָפְלִי	הִנָּשִׁי	wanting.
<i>Plur. m.</i>	נָפְשׁוּ	נָפְלוּ	הִנָּשׁוּ	
f.	נָפְשֶׁנָּה	נָפְלֶנָּה	הִנָּשֶׁנָּה	
<i>Impf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	יִנָּשׁ*	יִפֹּל*	[יִנָּשׁ]	יִנָּשׁ*
3. f.	תִּנָּשׁ	תִּפֹּל	תִּנָּשׁ	תִּנָּשׁ
2. m.	תִּנָּשׁ	תִּפֹּל	תִּנָּשׁ	תִּנָּשׁ
2. f.	תִּנָּשִׁי	תִּפֹּלִי	תִּנָּשִׁי	תִּנָּשִׁי
1. c.	אִנָּשׁ	אִפֹּל	אִנָּשׁ	אִנָּשׁ
<i>Plur. 3. m.</i>	יִנָּשׁוּ	יִפֹּלוּ	יִנָּשׁוּ	יִנָּשׁוּ
3. f.	תִּנָּשֶׁנָּה	תִּפֹּלֶנָּה	תִּנָּשֶׁנָּה	תִּנָּשֶׁנָּה
2. m.	תִּנָּשׁוּ	תִּפֹּלוּ	תִּנָּשׁוּ	תִּנָּשׁוּ
2. f.	[תִּנָּשֶׁנָּה]	[תִּפֹּלֶנָּה]	[תִּנָּשֶׁנָּה]	[תִּנָּשֶׁנָּה]
1. c.	נִינָּשׁ	נִפֹּל	נִינָּשׁ	נִינָּשׁ
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			יִנָּשׁ*	
<i>Part. act.</i>	נָפַשׁ		נָפַשׁ*	מִנָּשׁ*
<i>pass.</i>	נָפַשׁ			מִנָּשׁ

I. Weak Verbs, פ"א.

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>
<i>Perf.</i>	אָבַל	נִאֲבַל*	הִאֲבִיל*	הֵאֲבַל*

Like Verbs *primae gutturalis*.

<i>Inf.</i>		אָבַל, אֲבַל*	הִאֲבַל	הִאֲבִיל	הֵאֲבַל
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		אָבוֹל	הִאֲבַל	wanting.	wanting.
<i>Imp. Sing. m.</i>		אָבַל*	הִאֲבַל	הִאֲבַל	
<i>f.</i>		אֲבָלִי	&c.	&c.	wanting.
<i>Plur. m.</i>		אָבוּ			
<i>f.</i>		[אֲבָלָנָה]			
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יֵאֲבַל* (in pause	יֵאֲבַל*	יֵאֲבִיל*	יֵאֲבַל*
	3. f.	תֵּאֲבַל (יֵאֲבַל)	&c.	&c.	&c.
	2. m.	תֵּאֲבַל			
	2. f.	תֵּאֲבָלִי			
	1. c.	אֲבַל*			
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יֵאֲבָלוּ			
	3. f.	תֵּאֲבָלָנָה			
	2. m.	תֵּאֲבָלוּ			
	2. f.	[תֵּאֲבָלָנָה]			
	1. c.	נֵאֲבַל			
<i>Impf. with consec.</i>	<i>Wāw</i>	וַיֵּאֲמֹר* וַיֵּאֲבַל*			
<i>Part. act.</i>		אֹבֵל	נֹאֲבֵל	מֵאֲבִיל	
<i>pass.</i>		אָבוֹל			מֵאֲבָל

	Qal.	Niph'al.	
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יָשַׁב	*נוֹשַׁב	
3. f.		*נוֹשְׁבָה	
2. m.		נוֹשַׁבְתָּ	
2. f.		נוֹשַׁבְתְּ	
1. c.	regular.	נוֹשַׁבְתִּי	
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.		נוֹשְׁבוּ	
2. m.		נוֹשַׁבְתֶּם	
2. f.		נוֹשַׁבְתֶּן	
1. c.		נוֹשַׁבְנוּ	
<i>Inf.</i>	יֹסֵד, יָשַׁח, *יִשְׁבַּח	*הַיֹּשֵׁב	
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	יָשׁוּב	wanting.	
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	*יֹשֶׁב, דַּע	*הַיֹּשֵׁב	
f.	יֹשְׁבִי	הַיֹּשְׁבִי	
<i>Plur. m.</i>	יֹשְׁבוּ	הַיֹּשְׁבוּ	
f.	יֹשְׁבֹנָה	[הַיֹּשְׁבֹנָה]	
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	*יֹשֵׁב	*יִירֵשׁ	*יֹשֵׁב
3. f.	תֹּשֵׁב	תִּירֵשׁ	תֹּשֵׁב
2. m.	תֹּשֵׁב	תִּירֵשׁ	תֹּשֵׁב
2. f.	תֹּשְׁבִי	תִּירְשִׁי	תֹּשְׁבִי
1. c.	אֹשֵׁב	אִירֵשׁ	*אֹשֵׁב
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יֹשְׁבוּ	יִירְשׁוּ	יֹשְׁבוּ
3. f.	תֹּשְׁבֹנָה	[תִּירְשְׁנָה]	[תֹּשְׁבֹנָה]
2. m.	תֹּשְׁבוּ	תִּירְשׁוּ	תֹּשְׁבוּ
2. f.	[תֹּשְׁבֹנָה]	[תִּירְשְׁנָה]	[תֹּשְׁבֹנָה]
1. c.	נֹשֵׁב	נִירֵשׁ	נֹשֵׁב

Shortened *Impf.* (*Jussive*).*Impf. with Wāw consec.* *וַיֹּשֶׁב

<i>Part. act.</i>	יֹשֵׁב	*נוֹשֵׁב
<i>pass.</i>	יֹשׁוּב	

פ"י (for פ"י).

L. Verbs properly פ"י.

Hiph'el.	Hoph'al.	Qal.	Hiph'el.
*הוֹשִׁיב	*הוֹשֵׁב	יָטַב	*הִיטִיב
הוֹשִׁיבָה	הוֹשֵׁבָה		הִיטִיבָה
הוֹשִׁיבֶת	הוֹשֵׁבֶת		הִיטִיבֶת
הוֹשִׁיבִת	הוֹשֵׁבִת		הִיטִיבִת
הוֹשִׁיבִי	הוֹשֵׁבִי	regular.	הִיטִיבִי
הוֹשִׁיבוּ	הוֹשֵׁבוּ		הִיטִיבוּ
הוֹשִׁיבָתֶם	הוֹשֵׁבָתֶם		הִיטִיבָתֶם
הוֹשִׁיבְתֶן	הוֹשֵׁבְתֶן		הִיטִיבְתֶן
הוֹשִׁיבֶנּוּ	הוֹשֵׁבֶנּוּ		הִיטִיבֶנּוּ
*הוֹשִׁיב	*הוֹשֵׁב	יָטַב	*הִיטִיב
*הוֹשֵׁב		יָטוּב	*הִיטִיב
*הוֹשֵׁב			*הִיטִיב
*הוֹשֵׁב			*הִיטִיב
הוֹשִׁיכִי	wanting.		הִיטִיכִי
הוֹשִׁיכִי			הִיטִיכִי
[הוֹשִׁיכָנָה]			[הִיטִיכָנָה]
יוֹשִׁיב	*יוֹשֵׁב	*יוֹטַב	*יוֹיטִיב
תוֹשִׁיב	תוֹשֵׁב	תִּיטַב	תִּיטִיב
תוֹשִׁיב	תוֹשֵׁב	תִּיטַב	תִּיטִיב
תוֹשִׁיכִי	תוֹשִׁיכִי	תִּיטִיכִי	תִּיטִיכִי
אוֹשִׁיב	אוֹשֵׁב	אִיטַב	אִיטִיב
יוֹשִׁיבוּ	יוֹשֵׁבוּ	יִיטַבוּ	יִיטִיבוּ
[תוֹשִׁיכָנָה]	תוֹשִׁיכָנָה	תִּיטִיכָנָה	[תִּיטִיכָנָה]
תוֹשִׁיבוּ	תוֹשִׁיבוּ	תִּיטִיבוּ	תִּיטִיבוּ
[תוֹשִׁיכָנָה]	[תוֹשִׁיכָנָה]	[תִּיטִיכָנָה]	[תִּיטִיכָנָה]
נוֹשִׁיב	נוֹשֵׁב	נִיטַב	נִיטִיב
*יוֹשֵׁב			יִיטַב
וְיֹשֵׁב		וְיִטַב	וְיִטִּיב
*מוֹשִׁיב		יָטַב	מִיטִיב
	*מוֹשֵׁב	יָטוּב	

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'il.
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	קָם*	נָקַם*	הָקִים*
3. f.	קָמָה*	נָקְמָה*	הָקִימָה*
2. m.	קָמַת*	נָקְמוֹת	הָקִימוֹת*
2. f.	קָמַת	[נָקְמוֹת]	הָקִימוֹת
1. c.	קָמַתִּי	נָקְמוֹתִי	הָקִימוֹתִי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.	קָמוּ	נָקְמוּ	הָקִימוּ
2. m.	קָמַתֶּם	נָקְמוּתֶם	הָקִימוּתֶם
2. f.	[קָמַתֶּינָן]	נָקְמוּתֶינָן	[הָקִימוּתֶינָן]
1. c.	קָמַנּוּ	נָקְמוּנּוּ	הָקִימוּנּוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	קֹם*	הִקְוֹם*	הָקִים*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	קֹם*	הִקְוֹם, נָסֹג	הָקֵם*
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	קֹם*	הִקְוֹם*	הָקֵם*
f.	קָמִי*	[הִקְוִמִּי]	הָקִימִי*
<i>Plur.</i> m.	קָמוּ	הִקְוֹמוּ	הָקִימוּ
f.	קָמְנָה*		[הָקְמְנָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יָקֹם*, יִבֹּא	יִקְוֹם*	יָקִים*
3. f.	תִּקְוֹם	תִּקְוֹם	תִּקְוֹם
2. m.	תִּקְוֹם	תִּקְוֹם	תִּקְוֹם
2. f.	תִּקְוִמִּי*	[תִּקְוִמִּי]	תִּקְוִמִּי*
1. c.	אִקְוֹם	אִקְוֹם	אִקְוֹם
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יִקְוֹמוּ	יִקְוֹמוּ	יִקְוֹמוּ
3. f.	תִּקְוִמְיִנָּה, תִּשְׁבְּנָה*		תִּקְוִמְיִנָּה, תִּקְוִמְיִנָּה*
2. m.	תִּקְוֹמוּ	תִּקְוֹמוּ	תִּקְוֹמוּ
2. f.	תִּקְוִמְיִנָּה		[תִּקְוִמְנָה]
1. c.	נִקְוֹם	נִקְוֹם	נִקְוֹם
<i>Shortened Impf.</i>	יִקֵּם*		יִקֵּם*
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>	וַיִּקֵּם (pause וַיִּקֵּם)		וַיִּקֵּם*
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִשְׁפָּנִי*		יִקְיִמְנִי*
<i>Part. act.</i>	קֹם*	נָקֹם*	מִקְוֹם*
<i>pass.</i>	קֹם*		

Verbs, ע"י.

N. Weak Verbs, ע"י.

<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Pôlêl.</i>	<i>Pôlal.</i>	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>
*הוֹקֵם	*קוֹמֵם	*קוֹמֵם	*בָּן	*נָבֹן
[הוֹקֵמָה]	קוֹמְמָה	[קוֹמְמָה]	*בָּנָה	[נָבֹנָה]
הוֹקֵמֶת	קוֹמְמֶת	קוֹמְמֶת	*בָּנָת	נְבוֹנֹת
הוֹקֵמֶת	[קוֹמְמֶת]	[קוֹמְמֶת]	בָּנֶת	נְבוֹנוֹת
[הוֹקְמֵתִי]	קוֹמְמֵתִי	קוֹמְמֵתִי	[בָּנֵתִי]	נְבוֹנֹתִי
הוֹקֵמוֹ	קוֹמְמוֹ	קוֹמְמוֹ	בָּנוּ	
[הוֹקְמָתָם]	[קוֹמְמָתָם]	[קוֹמְמָתָם]	[בָּנָתָם]	See
הוֹקְמָתָן	קוֹמְמָתָן	קוֹמְמָתָן	[בָּנָתָן]	Verbs ע"י.
[הוֹקְמָנִי]	[קוֹמְמָנִי]	[קוֹמְמָנִי]	בָּנוּ	
*הוֹקֵם	קוֹמֵם		*בֵּין	
			בֵּן	
	קוֹמֵם		*בֵּין	
	[קוֹמְמִי]	wanting.	בֵּינִי	
	קוֹמְמוֹ		בֵּינוֹ	
	[קוֹמְמָנָה]		—	
*יִקֹּם	יִקֹּם	יִקֹּם	יָגִיל	
הוֹקֵם	תִּקְוֶם	[תִּקְוֶם]	תִּגְיֹל	
[הוֹקֵם]	תִּקְוֶם	תִּקְוֶם	תִּגְיֹל	
הוֹקְמִי	[תִּקְוֶמִי]	תִּקְוֶמִי	תִּגְיֹלִי	
[אֹקֵם]	אִיקֹּם	[אִיקֹּם]	אִגְיֹל	
יִקְמוּ	יִקְמוּ	יִקְמוּ	יִגְלוּ	
[הוֹקְמָנָה]	תִּקְוֶמָנָה	תִּקְוֶמָנָה	תִּגְלֹלָנָה	
הוֹקְמוּ	תִּקְוֶמוּ	[תִּקְוֶמוּ]	תִּגְיֹלוּ	
[תִּקְמָנָה]	תִּקְוֶמָנָה	תִּקְוֶמָנָה	תִּגְלֹלָנָה	
נִקֵּם	[נִקֵּם]	[נִקֵּם]	נִגִּיל	
			יִגֹּל	
			וַיִּגֹּל	
			יִרְיֵנִי	
	מִקֹּמֵם		לֵנִים, שָׁב	נָבֹן
*מִדְּקָם		מִקֹּמֵם	שִׁים, שוֹם	

		<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Pi'el.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	מָצָא*	נִמְצָא*	דָּבָא, מָצָא
	3. f.	מָצָאָה	נִמְצָאָה	[מָצָאָה]
	2. m.	מָצָאתָ*	נִמְצָאתָ*	מָצָאתָ*
	2. f.	מָצָאת	נִמְצָאת	[מָצָאת]
	1. c.	מָצָאתִי	נִמְצָאתִי	מָצָאתִי
<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	מָצְאוּ	נִמְצְאוּ	מָצְאוּ
	2. m.	מָצַאתֶם	נִמְצַאתֶם	מָצַאתֶם
	2. f.	[מָצַאתֶן]	[נִמְצַאתֶן]	[מָצַאתֶן]
	1. c.	מָצְאוּנִי	[נִמְצְאוּנִי]	מָצְאוּנִי
<i>Inf.</i>		מָצֵא	הִמְצֵא	מָצֵא
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		מָצֹא	נִמְצֹא	מָצֹא
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	m.	מָצֵא*	הִמְצֵא	מָצֵא
	f.	מָצֵאִי	[הִמְצֵאִי]	[מָצֵאִי]
<i>Plur. m.</i>		מָצְאוּ	הִמְצְאוּ	מָצְאוּ
	f.	מָצְאָנָה*	[הִמְצְאָנָה]	[מָצְאָנָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יִמְצָא*	יִמְצָא*	יִמְצָא
	3. f.	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא
	2. m.	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצָא
	2. f.	תִּמְצָאִי	תִּמְצָאִי	[תִּמְצָאִי]
	1. c.	אִמְצָא	אִמְצָא	אִמְצָא
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יִמְצְאוּ	יִמְצְאוּ	יִמְצְאוּ
	3. f.	תִּמְצְאָנָה*	תִּמְצְאָנָה*	תִּמְצְאָנָה*
	2. m.	תִּמְצְאוּ	תִּמְצְאוּ	[תִּמְצְאוּ]
	2. f.	תִּמְצְאָנָה	תִּמְצְאָנָה	תִּמְצְאָנָה
	1. c.	נִמְצָא	[נִמְצָא]	נִמְצָא
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>				
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		יִמְצָאֵךְ, יִמְצָאֵנִי		יִמְצָאֵנִי
<i>Part. act.</i>		מֹצֵא	נִמְצֵא	מִמְצֵא
	<i>pass.</i>	מְצוּא		

Verbs, ל"א.

<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
קָרָא [מִצָּא]	הִמְצִיא	[הִמְצָא]	הִתְמַצָּא
מִצָּאָה	הִמְצִיָּאָה	הִמְצָאָה	הִתְמַצָּאָה
מִצָּאת	*הִמְצִיָּאת	*[הִמְצָאת]	*הִתְמַצָּאת
מִצָּאת	הִמְצִיָּאת	הִמְצָאת	[הִתְמַצָּאת]
מִצָּאתִי	הִמְצִיָּאתִי	הִמְצָאתִי	הִתְמַצָּאתִי
מִצָּאוֹ	הִמְצִיָּאוֹ	הִמְצָאוֹ	הִתְמַצָּאוֹ
מִצָּאתְכֶם	הִמְצִיָּאתְכֶם	הִמְצָאתְכֶם	[הִתְמַצָּאתְכֶם]
מִצָּאתְךָ	[הִמְצִיָּאתְךָ]	הִמְצָאתְךָ	הִתְמַצָּאתְךָ
מִצָּאֵנוּ	הִמְצִיָּאֵנוּ	[הִמְצָאֵנוּ]	הִתְמַצָּאֵנוּ
wanting.	הִמְצִיא	wanting.	הִתְמַצָּא
	הִמְצָא		wanting.
	הִמְצָא		[הִתְמַצָּא]
wanting.	הִמְצִיָּאִי	wanting.	הִתְמַצָּאִי
	הִמְצִיָּאוֹ		הִתְמַצָּאוֹ
	[הִמְצִיָּאָנָה]		הִתְמַצָּאָנָה
יִמְצָא	יִמְצִיא	[יִמְצָא]	יִתְמַצָּא
[יִתְמַצָּא]	יִתְמַצִּיא	יִתְמַצָּא	יִתְמַצָּא
יִתְמַצָּא	יִתְמַצִּיא	יִתְמַצָּא	יִתְמַצָּא
יִתְמַצָּאִי	יִתְמַצִּיאִי	יִתְמַצָּאִי	[יִתְמַצָּאִי]
אִתְמַצָּא	אִתְמַצִּיא	אִתְמַצָּא	[אִתְמַצָּא]
יִתְמַצָּאוֹ	יִתְמַצִּאוֹ	יִתְמַצָּאוֹ	יִתְמַצָּאוֹ
*יִתְמַצָּאָנָה	*יִתְמַצִּאָנָה	*יִתְמַצָּאָנָה	[יִתְמַצָּאָנָה]
יִתְמַצָּאוֹ	יִתְמַצִּאוֹ	יִתְמַצָּאוֹ	יִתְמַצָּאוֹ
יִתְמַצָּאָנָה	יִתְמַצִּאָנָה	יִתְמַצָּאָנָה	[יִתְמַצָּאָנָה]
נִתְמַצָּא	נִתְמַצִּיא	נִתְמַצָּא	[נִתְמַצָּא]
	יִמְצָא		
	יִמְצִיָּאֵנִי		
	מִתְמַצִּיא		מִתְמַצָּא
מִתְמַצָּא		מִתְמַצָּא	

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Pi'el.
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	פָּלָה*	נִפְּלָה*	פִּילָה*
3. f.	פָּלְתָה*	נִפְּלְתָה*	פִּילְתָה*
2. m.	פָּלִיתָ*	נִפְּלִיתָ, יָתְ—	פִּילִיתָ*
2. f.	פָּלִית	נִפְּלִית	פִּילִית
1. c.	פָּלִיתִי	נִפְּלִיתִי	פִּילִיתִי, פָּלִיתִי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.	פָּלּוּ*	נִפְּלוּ	פִּילוּ
2. m.	פָּלִיתֶם	[נִפְּלִיתֶם]	פִּילִיתֶם
2. f.	פָּלִיתְנָן	[נִפְּלִיתְנָן]	[פִּילִיתְנָן]
1. c.	פָּלִינוּ	נִפְּלִינוּ	פִּילִינוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	פָּלֹת*	הִפְּלוֹת*	פִּילֹת*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	פָּלָה	נִפְּלָה, הִפְּקָה	פִּילָה, פָּלָה
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> m.	פָּלָה*	הִפְּלָה*	פִּילָה*, פָּל
f.	פָּלִי*	הִפְּלִי*	פִּילִי*
<i>Plur.</i> m.	פָּלוּ	הִפְּלוּ	פִּילוּ
f.	פָּלִינָה*	[הִפְּלִינָה]	[פִּילִינָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	יִפְּלָה*	יִפְּלָה*	יִפְּלָה*
3. f.	תִּפְּלָה	תִּפְּלָה	תִּפְּלָה
2. m.	תִּפְּלָה	תִּפְּלָה	תִּפְּלָה
2. f.	תִּפְּלִי*	[תִּפְּלִי]	תִּפְּלִי*
1. c.	אִפְּלָה	אִפְּלָה, אָפַ'	אִפְּלָה
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יִפְּלוּ	יִפְּלוּ	יִפְּלוּ
3. f.	תִּפְּלִינָה*	תִּפְּלִינָה*	תִּפְּלִינָה*
2. m.	תִּפְּלוּ	תִּפְּלוּ	תִּפְּלוּ
2. f.	תִּפְּלִינָה	תִּפְּלִינָה	תִּפְּלִינָה
1. c.	נִפְּלָה	[נִפְּלָה]	נִפְּלָה
<i>Shortened Impf.</i>	יִפְּלִ*	יִפְּלִ*	יִפְּלִ*
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִפְּלֶה, יִפְּלֶנִי*		יִפְּלֶה, יִפְּלֶנִי*
<i>Part. act.</i>	פָּלֶה*	נִפְּלֶה*	פִּילֶה*
<i>pass.</i>	פָּלוּי*		

	1. Sing.	2. Sing. m.	2. Sing. f.
<i>Perf. Qal. 3. m.</i>	נָחֵנִי	רָאֵךְ, עָשֵׂךְ	
	<i>P.</i> עָשֵׂנִי	<i>P.</i> עָנֶךְ, קָנֶךְ	
3. f.	עָשְׂתִנִּי		
2. m.	רָאִיתִנִּי		
	<i>P.</i> עָנִיתִנִּי		
2. f.	<i>Pi.</i> רָמִיתִנִּי		
1. c.		רָאִיתִיךְ	עָנִיתִיךְ
<i>Plur. 3. c.</i>	עָשֵׂנוּ	רָאֵךְ	<i>Pi.</i> כָּסוּךְ
1. c.		<i>Pi.</i> קִנִּיתִיךְ	
<i>Imper. 2. m.</i>	נָחֵנִי עָנֵנִי		
2. f.	<i>Hiph.</i> הָרִאֵנִי		
<i>Plur. 2. m.</i>	<i>Pi.</i> בָּסִינוּ		
<i>Impf. 3. m.</i>	יִרְאֵנִי	יִפְדֶּךְ יִחַתֶּךְ	
3. f.		תִּשָּׁבֶךְ	
2. m.	תִּרְאֵנִי		
2. f.			
1. c.		אָרְאֶךְ אָעֲנֶךְ	אָעֲרֶךְ
<i>Plur. 3. m.</i>	יַעֲשֵׂנוּ	<i>Pi.</i> יַפְתֶּנּוּ	
2. m.	תַּצִּינִי		
1. c.			

with Suffixes.

3. Sing. m.	3. Sing. f.	1. Plur.	3. Plur. m.
עָשָׂהוּ	רָאָהָ	עָשִׂנוּ	עָשׂוּם
<i>Pi.</i> כָּלָתוּ	<i>Pi.</i> צִוְּתָהּ		<i>Hiph.</i> הֶעֱלִתָם
<i>Pi.</i> כָּסִיתוּ	עָשִׂיתָהּ	<i>Pi.</i> דְּבִיתָנוּ	עָנִיתָם
עָשִׂיתִיהוּ } רָאִיתִיו }	רָאִיתָהּ		רָעִיתִים
עָשׂוּהוּ	רָאִיָּהּ		שָׁבוּם
<i>Pi.</i> קוֹנֵנָהוּ			
		<i>Hiph.</i> הִרְאֵנוּ	רָעָם
תָּלָהוּ			<i>Hiph.</i> הִבִּיטוּם
יִרְאֶהוּ } יִלְוֶנוּ }	יִרְאֶהָ } יִרְאֶנָּה }	<i>Pi.</i> יַצְנֵנוּ	יִחַצֵּם } יַעֲשִׂם }
<i>Hiph.</i> תִּשְׁקָהוּ	תַּעֲשֶׂהָ	<i>Hiph.</i> תִּתְעַנֵּנוּ	תִּתְעַרֵּם
תַּעֲשֶׂנוּ			<i>Pi.</i> תִּכְסִּימוּ
אֶרְאֶנוּ	אֶעֱשֶׂנָּה		אֶפְדֵּם
אֶעֱנֶהוּ	יַעֲשֶׂהָ	<i>Pi.</i> יַעֲנֵנוּ	
<i>Pi.</i> יִפְתָּהוּ			
נִשְׁקָנוּ	נַעֲשֶׂנָּה		תִּצְוִם

I

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

The numbers refer to the sections, except where otherwise indicated.
N. = note.

- A-sounds, 8 *a*, 9 *a* ff.
Abbreviations, 5 *m*.
Absolute cases, 143 *c* N.
Abstract, for concrete, 83 *c*: abstr. ideas expressed by the feminine, 122 *q*, *r*: by fem. in $\Pi\lambda$ -, 86 *k*: by the plural, 124 *a*, *d-f*: with the article, 126 *n*.
Accents, 3 *b*: names and laws of, 15: of the poetical books, 15 *h*, *i*.
Accentuation, 3 *b*: double accentuation in certain passages, 15 *p*.
Accusative expressed by $\Pi\lambda$ -, 117: as direct object of verb, 117: syntax of pronominal object and second accus., 117 *e*: introduced by λ (esp. late), 117 *n*: cognate accus., 117 *p-r*: pronominal suffix with dative force, 117 *x*: with verbs of putting on and off, 117 *y*, being filled, 117 *z*, dwelling (rare) 117 *bb*: double accus. (to clothe, present, support, meet, &c. *with*), 117 *cc-gg*: accus. of material (to make *of*), 117 *hh*: of product (make *into*), 117 *ii*: of the part affected, 117 *ll*: of place, 118 *d-g*: of nearer definition, 118 *h*: of time, 118 *i-k*: of cause, 118 *l*: defining the manner of an action, 118 *m-r*, 120 *b*: construed with passive verb, 121 *a*, *b*.
Accusative and infinitive construction, 157 *b* N.
Acrophony, 5 *e*.
Acrostic poems, 5 *h*.
Adjectival idea expressed by a substantive in the genitive, 128 *o*, *p*, 135 *n*; by a substantive as predicate, 141 *c*, *d*: adjective used as a substantive in the genitive, 128 *w*, 133 *h*, cf. with ordinal numerals, 134 *p*, end: used poetically for a substantive, 132 ■ *N*²: rarely stands before the subst., 132 *b*. See also Attributive ideas.
Adjectives, construction of, with substantives, 132: with the article, 126 *u*, *v*: with art. when subst. is without it, 126 *w*, *x* and *n*: without the article when subst. definite, 126 *z*: syntax of, as predicate in a noun-clause, 145 *r*.
Adverbs, 100: with suffixes, 100 *o*, *p*: adverbial ideas expressed by the infin. abs., 113 *h-k*: by infin. constr., 114 *n* and *n*: by finite verb, 120 *d-h*.
Adversative clauses, 163.
Affirmatives of the perfect, 40 *c*, 44: of the imperfect, 40 *c*, 47: of the noun, 85 *s-v*, 86 *h-l*.
Agreement of members of a sentence in gender and number, 145.
Aleph four times with Mappiq, 14 *d*: affixed to 3rd plur. perf. (rare), 23 *i*, 44 *l*: verbs *N*² *E*, 68.
Aleph prostheticum, 19 *m* and *n*.
Alphabet, old Hebrew, 5 *a*: origin of, 5 *g*.
Alphabetic poems, 5 *h*.
Amarna letters, 2 *b* *N*³, 2 *f* and *N*⁴.
Anacoluthon, 167 *b*.
Answers, affirmative, 150 *n*: negative, 150 *n*.
Any one, 139 *d*.
Aphaeresis, 19 *h*, *i*, 66 *a-c*, 69 *b*, *c*, *f-h*.
Apocope, 19 *l*: in verbs $\Pi\lambda$ -, 75 *k*.
Aposiopesis, 117 *l*, 167 *a*.
Appellatives, 125 *e-g*.
Apposition, 127 *h*, 130 *e*: in the wider sense, 131: to express attribute, material, contents, measure, &c., 131 *c-e*.
Arabic language and Arabisms, 1 *b*, *m*, 22 *s*, 24 *g* *N*, 35 *l* and *N*², 44 *a*, 47 *a* *N*, 48 *b*, 58 *l*.
Aramaic language and Aramaisms,

1 *c*, *m*, 2 *q*, *t*, 24 *e*, 44 *c*, 47 *a* *N*, *c* *N*:
 Pi'el, 52 *a*: Nûn epentheticum,
 58 *i-l*: Aram. forms of verbs, *y''y*,
 67 *g*: of verbs *y''y*, 72 *ee*: of verbs
h''h, 75 *hh*: Aram. termination of
 the feminine, 80 *h*: of the plural,
 87 *e*.
 Araq al-Emir, inscription of, 5 *a*.
 Archaisms, 2 *k*: supposed, in the
 Pentateuch, 2 *n*.
 Article, 35: syntax of, 126: with
 demonstrative force, 126 *a*, *b*:
 before names of classes, 126 *l-n*:
 in comparisons, 126 *o*, cf. *p*: with
 the attributive, 126 *u-a*: used as a
 relative, 138 *i*, *k*: punctuation of,
 35, *a-k*, *o*: rarely retained after pre-
 positions, 35 *n*: original form of,
 35 *l*: *h* elided after it, 35 *d*: omitted
 with *h''h*, *h''h* after a subst.
 with pronom. suff., 126 *y*: found
 anomalously with a noun in constr.
 st., 127 *f-i*.
 Ashdod, language of, 2 *w*.
 Asher, ben, 7 *h* *N*².
 Aspirates, 6 *n*.
 Asseverations, 149.
 Assimilation, 19 *b-f*, 54 *c*, *d*, 66 *d-g*: of
h and *h'* 71: 'backward-assimila-
 tion,' 19 *f* *N*.
 Assuan papyri, 1 *m*.
 Assyrian language, 1 *d*.
 Asyndeton, cases of, 120 *g*, *h*, 154 *a*
N (*a*).
 Athê merahîq, 20 *f*, *g*.
 Athnâh, chief divider of verse in
 prose, 15 *f*: secondary divider in
 poetry, 15 *h*.
 Attraction, cases of, 145 *u* *N*³, 146 *a*.
 Attribute, *see* Adjective.
 Attributive ideas expressed by *h''h*,
h''h, followed by a genitive,
 128 *s-v*: by the genitive, 128 *o*, *p*,
 135 *m*: by a substantive in appo-
 sition, 131 *c-e*: by a subst. as pre-
 dicate, 141 *c*, *d*: negative expressed
 by a noun-clause, 152 *u*, *v*. *See also*
 Adjectival idea.
 Babylonian language, 1 *a*, *d*, *e*, *i*.
 Babylonian punctuation, 42 *N*³.
 Bêgadkêphath letters, 3 *d*, 6 *n*, 12 *a*,
 13 *c*: aspiration of, 21.
 Ben Asher's recension of the text,
 7 *h* *N*².
 Ben Naphthali's recension of the
 text, 7 *h* *N*².
 Beth essentiae, 119 *i*: pretii, 119 *p*.
 Bodily and mental defects denoted

by adjectives of the form קטיל,
 84^b *d*.
 Boustrophedon, 1 *k* *N*², 5 *d* *N*³.
 Canaanite branch of the Semitic
 languages, 1 *b* (ii).
 Canaanite glosses in the cuneiform
 tablets of Tell el-Amarna, 2 *f* *N*¹.
 Cardinal numbers, 97.
 Case-endings, remains of early, 90:
h''h as locative, 90 *c* *e*, of time,
 90 *h*, in place-names and as a poeti-
 cal form without meaning, 90 *f*, *g*
 with *N*: punctuation and tone, 90 *i*:
h''h, 90 *k-m*, *o*: *h'* and *h'*, 90 *k*, *n*, *o*.
 Cases, absolute, 143 *c* *N*: instrumental,
 144 *m* *N*.
 Casus pendens, various uses of, 111 *h*,
 112 *n*, *t*, *mm*, *oo*, 116 *u*, 143, 159 *i*.
 Causal clauses, 106 *f*, 112 *nn*: syntax
 of, 158.
 Chaldee, incorrect use of the term,
 1 *c* *N*.
 Changes of consonants, 19.
 Chiasmus in the arrangement of
 words in parallel members of a
 verse, 114 *r* *N*, 142 *f* *N*.
 Circumstantial clauses, 156: express-
 ing negative qualities, 152 *u*: noun-
 clauses, 156 *c*: verbal, 156 *d*.
 Citation, formulae of, 150 *e*.
 Cognate accusative, 117 *p-r*.
 Cohortative, 48 *b*: form of, 48 *c*, *d*:
 meaning, 48 *e*: syntax of, 108:
 very rare in verbs *h''h*, 75 *l*.
 Coins, Hebrew, 2 *d* (*a*).
 Collective nouns, 123 *a*, *b*: in fem.
 sing., 122 *s*: names of classes used
 collectively, 126 *l-p*: with the plu-
 ral of the adj. or ptep., 132 *g*:
 with the predicate in the plur.
 masc., 145 *b-e*, in 3rd pl. fem., 145 *c*
 (*h''h*), in masc. sing., 145 *f*, in sing.
 followed by plur., 145 *g*, in fem.
 sing., 145 *k* (cf. 135 *p*).
 Common gender, 122 *b*, *d*.
 Comparatio decurtata, 118 *r* *N*, 133 *e* *N*.
 Comparative, expression of, 133 *a-f*.
 Comparative clauses, 161.
 Comparison, use of article in, 126 *o*, *p*.
 Compensatory lengthening, 25 *a*, 27 *c*,
e-h.
 Composition of words, 30 *p*, (*b*), *r*,
 81 *d*, 152 *a* *N*: of particles, 99 *e*.
 Compound ideas, how thrown into
 the plural, 124 *p-r*: with the article,
 127 *e*: with suffixes, 135 *n*.
 Compounds formed by *h''h* with a sub-
 stantive or adjective, 152 *a* *N*.

- Concessive clauses, 160.
- Concord of subject and object in gender and number, 145 *a-t*: cases of false concord, 145 *u*.
- Conditional sentences, perfect in, 106 *p*: imperf. in, 107 *x*: cohortative in, 108 *e, f*: jussive in, 109 *h*: imperat. in, 110 *f*: ptep. in, 159 *v*: ptep. without **DN**, 116 *w*, 159 *i*: perf. consec. in apodosis, 112 *ff-mm*: different types of, 159: without conditional particle, 112 *kk, ll*, 159 *b-k*.
- Conjugations, or verba derivata, 38 *b*, 39 *c, d*: number and arrangement of, 39 *e-f*: Niph'al, 51: Pi'el and Pu'al, 52: Hiph'il and Hoph'al, 53: Hithpa'el, 54: the less common conjugations, 39 *g*, 55: conjugation of aim or attack (Pô'el), 55 *c*.
- Conjunctions, 104.
- Conjunctive accents, 15 *g, i*.
- Consecutio temporum, perf. and imperf. with wāw consec., 49: perf. with wāw consec., 112.
- Consecutive clauses, 107 *u*: syntax of, 166.
- Consonants, 5: changes of, 19: pronunciation and division of, 6: transcription of their names, 5 *fN*: weak consonants, 7 *a-g*: softening of, 19 *o*.
- Constructio ad sensum, 132 *g*, 145 *a-l*: asyndetos, 120 *g, h*, 154 *a N (a)*: praegnans, 119 *x, y, ff, gg*.
- Continuous action expressed by infin. abs., 113 *s-u*.
- Continuous progress expressed by duplication of a word, 133 *k*.
- Contraction of vowels, 7 *a*.
- Co-ordination of verbal ideas instead of subordination, 120.
- Copula, *see* Wāw copulativum: verbal, how expressed, 141 *f-h*.
- Cuneiform inscriptions, 1 *d, m N¹*, 5 *g (b)*, 6 *b*.
- Dageš forte, 12: in place of a letter assimilated, 19 *b-f*: orthophonism, 20 *g*, 13 *c*: necessarium, compensativum, characteristicum, 20 *a*: euphonicum, 20 *c*: conjunctivum, 20 *c-f*: dirimens, 20 *h*: affectuosum, 20 *i*: firmativum, 20 *k*: implicitum, 20 *m*, 22 *c*: omission of, 20 *l, m*: in gutturals, 22 *b, s*: occasionally in **7**, 22 *q (a)*, *s*: four times in **N** (acc. to others Mappiq), 14 *d*: omitted sometimes in 2nd radical of verbs **77**, 67 *g, dd*. *See also* Strengthening.
- Dageš lene, 13, 21: after יהוה (i. e. **יהוה**), 21 *c*: omitted anomalously after consonantal **י** and **י**, 21 *c*: exceptional cases of (**בב, ככ, פפ, מם**), 21 *d*.
- Dative, 119 *s*.
- Dativus ethicus, 119 *s*, 135 *i*: dative expressed by a suffix, 117 *x*.
- Decalogue, double accentuation of, 15 *p*.
- Dehiq, 20 *c*.
- Denominative nouns, *see* Nouns: verbs, *see* Verb.
- Desiderative sentences, 151.
- Determination of nouns, 125: omission of it, 117 *q*, 126 *p*: determination of proper names, 125 *c-f*: determination by the article, 126: by a following determinate genitive, 127: determination of numerals, 134 *k*.
- Diacritical points, *see* Puncta extraordinaria.
- Dialects in the O. T., 2 *w*.
- Diminutives, 86 *g* and *n*.
- Diphthongs, 7 *a*, 8 *m*, 24 *f*.
- Disjunctive accents, 15 *f, h*.
- Disjunctive questions, 150 *f-i*.
- Dissimilation of vowels, 27 *x*.
- Distributive numerals, 134 *q*.
- Doubling of consonants, *see* Strengthening.
- Dual, 88: with the plural of the adjective, 132 *f*: with predicate in the plur., 145 *n*: in numerals, 97 *g, h*, 134 *r*: place-names doubtfully so explained, 88 *c*.
- E-sounds, 7 *a, b, e*, 8 *b*, 9 *i-m*.
- Each, every, how expressed, 139 *b, c*.
- East Semitic, 1 *d*.
- Elatives, 85 *b*, 133 *a N*.
- Elegy, rhythm of, in Hebrew, 2 *r*.
- Elision, *see* Syncope and elision.
- Ellipse of the pronominal object, 117 *f*: other cases of ellipse (real or apparent), 116 *s*, 118 *s N* (in comparisons), 134 *n* (of names of measures, weights, &c.), 144 *σ* (due to corruption).
- 'Emblematic Mashal,' 161 *a N*.
- Emphasis expressed by infin. abs., 114 *l-r, v-x*: by cognate accus., 113 *w* (end): by cognate accus. with defining adjective, 117 *q*: by duplication of a word, 123 *e*, 133 *k, l*: by combination of different derivatives from the same root, 133 *l*: by

Himyaritic, 1 *b* (i) : writing, 1 *k* N².
 Hiph'il, 53 : 'internal,' 53 *d* : infinitive pointed -*ה*, 53 *l* : the *ה* in infin. elided after preposition, 53 *g* : imperf. with *—* for *—* (as *יִרְכּוּ*), 53 *n* : with *ה* retained in imperf. after preformatives, 53 *g* : denominatives in Hiph., 53 *g*.
 Hireq, different kinds of, 8 *b*, 9 *g*, *h* : compaginis, 90 *k-n*.
 Hithpa'el, 54 : sometimes construed with an accusative, 54 *f*, 117 *w*.
 Hithpa'lél, 55 *d*, 72 *m*, 75 *kk*.
 Hithpapel, 55 *g*, 67 *l*.
 Hithpô'el, 55 *b*, 67 *l*.
 Hôlem, 8 *c-g* : written defectively, 8 *i-l* : its origin, 9 *p-s* : changed to games in pause, 29 *u*.
 Homogeneous consonants, 6 *g* : vowels, 24 *b, f*.
 Homorganic consonants, 6 *g*.
 Hoph'al, 53 *b, h, s, t* : *ה* retained once in ptep., 53 *s*.
 Hothpa'al, 54 *b, h, l*.
 Hypothetical sentences, *see* Conditional sentences.
 I-sounds, 8 *b*, 9 *g, h* : from *a* 27 *s, t* : in impf., 47 *b* : in Niph., 51 *a* : in Pi., 52 *a* : in Hiph., 53 *a* : in nouns with preformative *ו*, 85 *f* : lengthened to *ē*, 93 *c*.
 Imperative, forms in Qal, 46 : shortened and lengthened forms of, 48 *i-l*, 75 *k* : with suffixes, 61 *f-h* : syntax of, 110 : infinitive absolute used with force of imperative, 113 *bb*.
 Imperfect, the name, 47 *a* N : formation and inflexion of, 47 : unusual forms of, 47 *k* : form *חֲסִטְלָנָה* as 3rd fem. sing. or 2nd masc. sing., 47 *k* : 3rd pl. masc. in *ן*, 47 *m* : jussive and cohortative forms of, 48 : with wāw consecutive, 49 *c-g*, 111 : with suffixes, 60 : its syntax (alone), 107 : expressing custom or habit, 107 *e, g* : with wāw consec., 111 : subordinated to another verb, 120 *c*.
 Imperfect Hiph'il with *—* for *—* (as *יִרְכּוּ*), 53 *n* : with *ה* retained after preformatives, 53 *g*.
 Impersonal construction of *הָיָה*, &c., 144 *b* : impersonal passive, 121 *a*.
 Imprecation, formulae of, 149 *d*.
 Incomplete retrocession of the tone, 29 *f*.
 Indefinite subject of verb, expressed

by 3rd masc. sing., 144 *d, e*, by 3rd plur., 144 *f, g*, by 2nd sing. masc. (rare), 144 *h*, by ptep. plur., 144 *i*, by passive, *k*.
 Indeterminateness expressing amplification, 125 *c*.
 Indogermanic languages compared, 1 *e, g, h, i* (loan-words in), 10 *e* N¹, 20 *l* N, 22 *c* N, 27 *t* N, 31 *a*, 33 *a*, 51 *c-e*, 52 *f* N, 53 *g* N, 55 *f* N, 99 *b* and N, 132 *a* N, 133 *b* N¹, 135 *i* N, *q* N, 145 *k* N¹, 155 *b* N.
 Infinitive, 45 : with suffixes, 61 *a-e* : use of the infinitive absolute, 113 : as a casus adverbialis, 113 *h-k* : to strengthen the idea of the verb, 113 *l-r* : in place of the finite verb, 113 *y-gg* : infinitive construct, unusual forms in Qal, 45 *c-e*, in Pi'el, 52 *p* (cf. 84^b *e*), in Hiph'il, 53 *l*, 86 *k*, in Hithpa'el, 54 *k* : of *נָתַן*, 66 *i* : in verbs *יָעַץ*, 67 *o* : in *יָצַע*, 69 *m* with N : in *יָעַץ* (Hiph.), 72 *z*, cf. 85 *c* : *נָתַן* 74 *h*, 75 *qq* : *נָתַן*, 75 *n* (cf. 69 *m* N), *ff, kk* : syntax of the infin. constr., 114 : with *ל* to express a future, 114 *h-k*, obligation, 114 *l*, as object of another verb, 114 *m*, gerundial, 114 *o* : after *וְ*, 114 *p* : infinitive construct continued by a finite verb, 114 *r* : how negated, 114 *s* : construction with subject and object, 115 : infinitive Hiph'il pointed -*ה*, 53 *l*, with *ה* elided after preposition, 53 *g* : Niph'al with *ה* elided, 51 *l*.
 Instrument, introduced by *בְּ*, 119 *o* : accusative as a supposed casus instrumentalis, 114 *m* N.
 Interjections, 30 *s*, 105 : syntax of, 148.
 Interpunctuation, the accents as marks of, 15 *d, m-o*.
 Interrogative sentences, 107 *t*, 150 : disjunctive, 150 *c, g* : indirect, 150 *i* : expressing a wish, 151 *a, b* : expressed without an interrog. particle, 150 *a, b*.
 Interrogative words and particles, 150 *c, d*.
 Involved series of sentences, 167 *c*.
 Jews, Jewish, 2 *a*.
 Jussive, forms of, 48 *a-c, f-h* : syntax of, 109 : used absolutely, 109 *b, c* : depending on another verb, 109 *f, g, i* : in conditional sentences, 109 *h*, 159 *d* : jussive forms in poetry without jussive force, 109 *k*.

Kaph veritatis, 118 *x*.
K^cthibh, 17 *a-c*.

Lamed auctoris, 129 *c*.

Lamentation metre, 2 *r*.

Letters, forms and names of, 5 *a, b, e, f*: final, 5 *c*: order of, 5 *h, i*: numerical value, 5 *k*.

Litterae dilatabiles, 5 *d*: maiusculae, minusculae, suspensae, 5 *n*: spirantes, 6 *n*: quiescibiles, 8 *h n*, 23: incompatibiles, 30 *m n*: serviles, 30 *g*, 81 *b*: compaginis, 90 *k-o*.

Loan-words in Hebrew and Greek, 1 *i*.

Locative, 90 *a, c-i*.

Mandaeans, 1 *c*.

Mappiq, 8 *m n*¹, 14 *a-d*: omitted in 3rd fem. sing. suffix of verb, 58 *g*: of noun, 91 *e*: in מֵלֵךְ, 103 *g* (end): found four times in מֵלֵךְ, 14 *d*.

Maqqēph, 9 *c, d*, 16 *a, b*.

Masculine as prior gender, 122 *g*, 146 *d*: masc. nouns with plur. in מֵלֵךְ, 87 *m-p*.

Masora and Masoretic text, 3 *b, c*: masora marginalis (magna and parva) and finalis, 17 *d, e*.

Masoretic terms explained, 17 *e*.

Material expressed by the genitive, 128 *o*, 135 *n*.

Matres lectionis, 8 *h n*.

Mešā' inscription, 1 *b* (ii), *k, 2 d*, final vowels in, 7 *b-d n*¹: מֵלֵךְ = מֵלֵךְ, p. 105 *n*: מֵלֵךְ = מֵלֵךְ, 32 *k n*: wāw consecutive, 49 *a n*: the forms מֵלֵךְ, &c., 54 *l*: לֵכְךָ, 69 *h n*: מֵלֵךְ, 75 *b n*: fem. sing. abs. in מֵלֵךְ, 80 *f n*: plur. masc. in מֵלֵךְ, 87 *e n*: suffixes, 91 *k n*: the imperfect, 107 *b n*¹: impf. consec. 111 *h n*: article omitted with מֵלֵךְ though the noun has it, 126 *y*: use of the separate pronoun, 135 *a n*: casus pendens, 143 *b n*.

Metathesis, *see* Transposition.

Metheg, distinguishing ā from ʾ, 9 *u, v*: marks secondary tone, 15 *c, 29 b, 20 f*: various kinds of, 16 *c-i*: with short vowel in open syllable, 26 *i-l* (but cf. 0 *n*): with šere in closed ultima, 29 *f*: in perf. consec. 49 *i*.

Metre in Hebrew, 2 *r*.

Mil'el and Milra', 15 *c, 20 f*.

Mishna, 3 *a*.

Mixed forms, 78 *d*.

Moods, expression of, 40 *a, 106 p, 107 m-x*: modus rei repetitae (imperf. as frequentative), 107 *e*.

Multiplicatives (*once, twice, &c.*), how expressed, 134 *r*.

Nabataean inscriptions, 1 *c*.

Naphthali, ben, 7 *h n*.

Names of countries, peoples, and towns, fem., 122 *i*: of places and peoples with the article, 125 *d n, e*: with a following genitive, 125 *h*.

Nasog ahor, 29 *e*.

Negative sentences, 152.

Negatives, 152: two negatives intensify negation, 152 *y*: influence extending over a following clause, 152 *z*.

Neuter, wanting in Hebrew, 80 *a*: expressed by feminine, 122 *q* with *n*, 135 *p*: by plur. of adjectives, 122 *q*: by suffix of 3rd plur., 135 *p*: in pronoun, 136 *b*, in verb, 144 *b, c*.

Niph'al, 51: tolerativum, 51 *c*: reflexive and reciprocal senses of, 51 *c-e*: infin. with ה elided after a preposition, 51 *l*.

Nithqattēl, 55 *k* (9).

Nomen regens and rectum, 89 *a*.

Nomen unitatis, 122 *l*.

Nominativus pendens resumed by a pronoun, 143.

North Semitic, 1 *c*.

Nota accusativi, 57: when used, 117 *a-e*.

Nothing, no one, how expressed, 139 *d*.

Noun-clauses, ptep. in, 116 *m-r*: defined, 140 *a*: syntax of, 141: shortened unusually (rare), 147 *e*: negatived by מֵלֵךְ and מֵלֵךְ, 152 *a, d, i-m*: relative, 155 *e*.

Noun-forms with verbal force (nomina verbi), 45 *e* (with prefixed מֵלֵךְ), 115 *d*.

Nouns, derivation and various kinds of, 81: primitive, 30 *f, 79 a, 82*: on nouns in general, 83: forms derived from the simple stem, 84^a, from intensive stems, 84^b: nouns formed with preformatives (מֵלֵךְ, הֵלֵךְ, &c.), 85 *b-r*, with affirmatives, 85 *s-v*: quadrilaterals and quinquelaterals, 85 *w*: denominatives, 86: with pronominal suffixes, 91: paradigms of, 93: forms with peculiar flexion (מֵלֵךְ, מֵלֵךְ, &c.), 96: distinctions of gender in, 122: collectives, 123 *a, b*: with the article, 126: appellatives, 125 *e-g*: nomina unitatis, 122 *s, t*, 123 *b*: abstracts, *see* Abstract. *See also* Names.

Number in the construction of subject and predicate, 145.

Number of words in the O. T., 3 *w n*.
 Numeral adverbs, 124 *r*.
 Numerals, 97: syntax of, 134: order of compound numerals in different books, 134 *c n, h, i*.
 Numeration, ascending (rhetorical figure), cases of, 134 *s*.
 Numerical signs, 5 *k*.
 Nûn paragogicum, in imperf., 47 *m*: in perf. (?), 44 *l*: assimilation of Nûn, 19 *b, c*, 66 *d*: Nûn energicum (demonstrativum, epentheticum), 58 *i-l*: inversum, 5 *n*.

O-sounds, 8 *c, d, 9 p-s*.
 Oaths, formulae of, 149.
 Object, in the accusative, 117: introduced by ה, 143 *e*: introduced by ו instrumenti, 119 *q*: absolute or internal (cognate accusative), 117 *p, q*: dative expressed by accus. suffixes, 117 *x*.
 Object of verb anticipated by pronom. suffix, as in Aram., 131 *m, o*.
 Object-clauses, 157.
 Occupations denoted by nouns of the form לָקַח, 84^b *b*.
 Old Hebrew, 1 *k, 2 a*.
 'Ôle w'yôrêdh, principal divider of verse in poetry, 15 *b*.
 One, indefinite, how expressed, 144 *d-h*.
 Onomatopoeica, 1 *h, 30 h*.
 Optative, 109 *b, c*.
 Oratio obliqua, how expressed, 157.
 Order of the alphabet, 5 *h, i*.
 Order of words, 114 *r n* (chiasmus): in noun-clauses, 141 *l-n*: varieties of, in verbal clauses, 142 *a, f, g*: with the infinitive constr., 115 *e-k*.
 Ordinal numbers, 98, 134 *o, p*.
 Oriental and Occidental texts, 7 *h n*.
 Orthography of Hebrew in the masoretic text and previously, 7.

Pa'lêl, 55 *d*: in three פ"ל verbs, 75 *kk*.
 Panammu inscription, 1 *m*.
 Papyri of Assuan, 1 *m*.
 Parallel texts, 3 *g*.
 Parallelism of members, 2 *q, 150 h*.
 Participle, forms of, in Qal, 50:
 Niph'al, 51 *a*: Pi'el and Pu'al, 52 *a-c*: with aphaeresis of ב, 52 *s*:
 Hiph'il and Hoph'al, 53 *a, b*:
 anomalous forms in Hiph., 53 *o*:
 with suffix, 61 *h*: fem. in פִּי־
 84^a *s*, 94 *d*: plur. in פִּי־ 93 *qq*;
 force of, 107 *d*: syntax of, 116: construed as verb or noun, 116 *f-i*:
 passive ptep. construed with accus.

or genitive, 116 *k, l*: of imminent future, 116 *p*: subject with הֵיךָ (of continuous action), 116 *r*: subject omitted, 116 *s, t*: participle absolute, 116 *w*: continued by finite verb, 116 *x*.

Particles, 99.

Partitive sense of ו, 119 *m*: of מן, 119 *w n*.

Paseq, p. 59 *n²*.

Passive, 39 *e, 51 f* (Niph'al): probable passives of Qal, 52 *e, 53 u*: construction of passives, 121: expressed by the 3rd plur. active, 144 *f, g*, by the active participle, 144 *i*: impersonal passive, 121 *a*: passive verbs construed with את, 121 *a, b*: agent after passive expressed by ה, מן, and (rarely) ו, 121 *f*.

Pathah, 8 *a, 9 e*: preferred with gutturals, 22 *d*: furtive, 8 *f, 22 f, g, 65 a-e*: as a helping vowel, 27 *r, 28 c, e n², 65 g, 84^a a*: in the imperfect of verbs פ"ל, 75 *bb*: in pause for Šere, 29 *q, 51 m*: before a guttural (esp. פ) with Qameš changed to Še'ghôl, 27 *q, 29 v*: in perf. Pi'el for Šere, 52 *a, l*.

Patronymics, 86 *h*.

Pause, 29 *i-v*: pausal forms with lesser distinctive accents, 29 *i*.

Pe'al'al, 55 *e*.

Pentateuch, linguistic character of, 2 *m, n*.

Perfect, 40: flexion of, 44: 3rd fem. sing. in פִּי, 44 *f, 72 o*: 2nd fem. sing. in פִּי, 44 *h*: 1st sing. in פִּי, 44 *i*: 3rd plur. in פִּי(?), 44 *l*: did Hebrew possess 3rd pl. fem. in פִּי? 44 *m*: contraction of last radical with affirmative of perfect, 44 *o*: meaning of, 47 *a n*: with suffixes, 59: syntax of, 106: not precativè, 106 *n n²*: perfectum confidentiae, 106 *n*: propheticum, 106 *n*: with ו consec., 49 *a*, change of tone, *h-l*, syntax, 112: with ו consec. as a frequentative, 112 *e-o, dd, ee*: carrying on the protasis, 112 *p*, introducing the apodosis, 112 *f-i*: with simple ו of a single act, in narrative, 112 *pp-uu*.

Periphrastic expression of qualities

by means of אֵשׁ, בָּרַךְ, בָּעַל, 128 *s-v*.

Periphrastic future, 114 *p n*.

Permutation, 131 *k*.

Permutative, 131 *k-o*.

Person, abrupt changes of, in poetry, 144 *p*.

Personification of countries or peoples, 122 *i*.

Phoenician and Punic language, 1 *a*, *b* (ii), 2 *f*, 10 *e n*¹, *p*. 106 *n*, § 36 *n*, 49 *a n*, 80 *f*, 87 *d*: writing, 1 *l*, 7 *d n*.

Phonetic system of Hebrew, 6 *o*, *p*.

Phonetics, 6 *a*, *b*.

Pi'el, 52: privativum, 52 *h*: intensive sense of, 52 *f*, *h*: rare in verbs 7" *y*, 72 *m*.

Pi'el, 55 *d*: in verbs 7" *y*, 72 *m*.

Pilpēl, 55 *f*: in verbs 7" *y*, 67 *l*: in verbs 7" *y*, 72 *m*.

Pleonastic use of the pronoun, 135 *a*, *b*: of the negative, 152 *y*.

Pluperfect, 106 *f*, 111 *g*: pluperf. subjunctive, 106 *p*.

Plural, terminations of, 87: in 7" *—*, 87 *e*: 7" *—*, 7" *—*, 7" *—* not plural endings, 87 *f-h*: double plural ending in constr. st. of certain words, 87 *s*: double plur. of subst. and following genitive, 124 *q*: uses and senses of, 124: unusual constructions of, 145 *h-m*: plur. forms of prepositions, 103 *n*, *o*: plur. suffix referring to collective singular, 135 *p*: plur. predicate of a collective singular, 145 *b-g*.

Pluralia tantum, 124 *f n*.

Pluralis excellentiae or majestatis, 124 *g-i* and *n*: its construction, 132 *h*: pl. of extension, 124 *a-c*: intensive pl., 124 *a*, *d*, *e*: of the result or product, 124 *m*: amplifying plur., 124 *b*, *d-f*: expressing abstract ideas, 124 *d*, *f*: pl. of pronoun to denote ■ group of actions (=it), 135 *p*.

Plurals of compound ideas, 124 *p-r*: of names of animals or things construed with a fem. sing., 145 *k*.

Pō'el, 55 *b*, *c*: in verbs 7" *y*, 67 *l*.

Poetic style, 2 *q-s*.

Point used to divide words, 3 *g n*.

Polpal, 55 *f*.

Polysyndeton, 154 *a n*.

Potential sense of the imperfect, 107 *r-w*.

Precative, 109 *b*, *c*.

Predicate, without the article, 126 *i*, *k*: agreeing (or not) with the subject, 145: with compound subj., 146: attracted to the principal idea of a compound subject, 146 *a*: subst.

as predicate where we should use an adjective, 141 *c*, *d*.

Prefixes, *see* Prepositions.

Preformatives of the imperfect, 47: of the noun, 85.

Pregnant construction with prepositions, 119 *ee*: with 7" *—*, 119 *x*, *y*, *ff*: with 7" *—*, 7" *—*, 7" *—*, 119 *gg*.

Prepositions, 101: prefixed, 102: with suffixes, 103: under the government of the verb, 119: compound prepositions, 119 *b-e*: chief meanings of, 7" *—*, 7" *—*, 7" *—*, 119 *g-dd*: pregnant uses of, 119 *ee-gg*: force of, extending over parallel clause, 119 *hh*: with adverbs (rare), 119 *ii*: prep. (esp. 7" *—*) not used after 7" *—*, 118 *s-w*, found exceptionally, 118 *s n*.

Present expressed by the Perfect, 106 *g*, *h*.

Preterite, *see* Perfect.

Pretonic vowels, 26 *e*: with 7" *—*, 7" *—*, 102 *f-k*: with 7" *—* before suffix, 103 *c*: with 7" *—*, 104 *g*.

Printed texts, earliest Hebrew, 3 *e n*.

Prohibitions, expressed by 7" *—* or 7" *—* with jussive or imperfect, 107 *o*, 109 *c*, *d*, 152 *f*.

Pronominal ideas expressed by substantives, 139.

Pronominal suffix anticipating noun, attached to verb, 131 *m*, *o*; to subst. or prep., 131 *n*.

Pronouns, 32: syntax of, 135-8: personal, 32, 135: oblique cases of, 135 *i-k*: suffixes, 33, with the verb, 58, with the noun, 91, with adverbs, 100 *o*, *p*, with prepositions, 103: suffix of 3rd fem. sing. referring to entire sentences, 135 *p*: demonstrative, 34, 136, used relatively, 138 *g*, *h*: relative, 36, 138: indefinite, 37 *g*, 137 *c*: interrogative, 37 *a-f*, 137 *a-c*: suffix reflexive, 135 *i*, *k*: suffix possessive, 33, 135 *m-o*: suffix as genitive, subjective or objective, 135 *m*: separate pronoun in nominative emphasizing a suffix, 135 *d-h*: reciprocal, 139 *c* with *n*, *e*.

Pronunciation of Hebrew, 6 *a*, *b*, 48 *f*.

Prosthetic Aleph, 19 *m*.

Pu'al, 52 *b-d*, *h* (end), *q-s*: as passive of Qal, 52 *e*.

Pu'al, 55 *d*.

Puncta extraordinaria, 6 *n*.

Punctuation, Babylonian, 8 *g n*.
Punic, *see* Phoenician.

Qal, form and meaning of, 43 : probable passives of, 52 *e*, 53 *u*.

Qameš, 8 *a*, 9 *a-d* : its pronunciation, 8 *d* : Qameš impurum, 25 *c*.

Qameš-hatûph, 8 *c*, 9 *s* : how distinguished from Qameš, 9 *u*, *v*.

Qêrê, 17 *a*, *b* : perpetuum, 17 *c*.

Qibbus, 8 *c*, 9 *n*, *o*.

Qina-metre, 2 *r*.

Quadrilaterals, 30 *p*, *q* : nouns, 85 *w* : verbs, 56.

Quantity of vowels, p. 40 (Preliminary remark).

Questions indicated by tone, 150 *a*, *b* : disjunctive, 150 *g* : double, 150 *h* : indirect, 150 *i* : expressing rhetorically a denial, 148 *c*, 150 *d*, 151 *a*, *b*.

Quiescent letters, *see* Letters.

Quinquilaterals, 30 *p*, *r*, 85 *w*.

Radical letters, 30 *c-e*.

Raphe, 6 *n*, 14 *e*.

Reciprocity expressed by . . . אִשׁוּחִי (רַעוּהוּ) אִשׁוּחִי by Niph'al, 51 *d* : by Hithpa'el, 54 *f*.

Reduplication of letters, in verbs, 55 *d-g*, in nouns, 84^b *k-p*.

Reflexive use of לְ (ethical dative), 119 *s* : of Niph'al, 51 *c* : of Hithp., 54 *e* : of pronouns, 57 *n*, 135 *i*, *k*.

Relative sentences, 138 *a-f*, 155 : expressed without אֲשֶׁר, 155 *f-m*, 156 *b* : in genitive after constr. st., 130 *c*, without אֲשֶׁר, 130 *d*, 152 *a n* (end), *u* (2nd part), *v*, 155 *e* : expressed by הֵן, הִיא, הוּא, 138 *g* : by article (in late Hebrew), 138 *i* (cases due to false vocalization or accentuation, 138 *k*) : independent rel. clause as subject or object of verb, or genitive of a noun, or governed by a preposition, 155 *n*.

Relative pronoun, 36, 138.

Repetition of words, without וְ, to express distribution (= 'every'), 123 *c*, *d* : emphasis, 123 *e* : the superlative, 133 *l* : with וְ, to express summation, 123 *c*, to express difference (וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ), 123 *f*.

Resh occasionally with Dageš, 22 *s*.

Rhythm of Hebrew poetry, 2 *q*, *r*.

Roots, 30 *c*, *d*.

Sabaeen, 1 *b* (i), *k n*.

Samaritan, 1 *c*.

Šaph'el, 55 *i*, cf. 30 *p*.

Schema etymologicum, 117 *p-r*.

Scriptio continua, 3 *g n*.

Scriptio plena and defectiva, 8 *i-l*, 25 *b*.

Seal-stones, engraved, 2 *d*.

Sêghôl, 8 *b*, 9 *m*, 27 *p-r* : as a helping vowel, 27 *r*, 28 *e*, 84^a *a* : rarely after gutturals, 22 *h* : before gutturals (esp. ה) with Qameš, for Pathah, 27 *q*, 29 *v* : in pause for Šere in Pi'el, 52 *n*.

'Segholate' nouns, forms of, 84^a *a-d* : in constr. st. and with suffixes (paradigms), § 93 *c-e*, *g-r*, feminine forms, 95 *d-f* : of the form עֲרֵךְ in constr. st., 93 *h* : of the form עֲרֵכְךָ (dageš in 3rd radical) in constr. st. plur., 93 *m* : explanation of forms from verbs הִלַּךְ (as הִפְרִי), 84^a *c* (e), 93 *x-z*, 95 *d-f* : constr. st. of nouns of the form הִפְרִי sometimes segholate in form, 93 *h h*.

Self, idea of, how expressed, 135 *a*, *i*, *k*, 139 *f*, with *n*, cf. *g*.

Semitic languages, 1 : their grammatical structure, 1 *f* : their relation to one another, 1 *e*, *m*, *n* : and to other languages, 1 *g-i* : their age, 1 *m*, *n* : writing, 1 *k*, *l*.

Sentences, 140 : compound, 140 *d*, 143 : incomplete, 147 : restrictive and intensive, 153 : connected by וְ, 154 : divided by Paseq, 15 *f n*².

Separating vowels, 67 *d n*, 72 *i*.

Septuagint, 3 *a*, 6 *b*, *p*. 35 *n*.

Šere, 8 *b*, 9 *i-l* : in pause for Sêghôl in verbs הִלַּךְ, 75 *h h n* : changed to pathah in pause, 29 *q* : in Hithpa'el changed to qameš in pause, 29 *s*, 55 *k*.

Serviles, *see* Formative letters.

Šewâ, simple and compound, 10, 21 *e, f*, 22 *i-p*, 24 *b-d*, 63 *ff* : mobile, 10 *b*, *c*, *l*, 20 *m*, 21 *e, f*, 22 *l*, 27 *e*, *i-m* : simple, under gutturals, 22 *m*, *n*, 63 *a*, *c*, 65 *g* : quiescent (silent, syllable divider), 10 *i*, 22 *m*, 24 *b*.

Sibilants, 6 *h-l* : transposition of, 19 *n*, 54 *b*.

Sillûq with Sôph pasûq, 15 *f*.

Siloam inscription, 2 *d n* : orthography of, 7 *f*.

Simultaneity of actions expressed by noun-clauses, 141 *e*, 164 *a*.

Singular with distributive force, 145 *l, m*.

Softening of consonants (rare), 19 *o*.

Some, how expressed, 139 *h* with *n*.

Sonants, 6 *o, p*.

South Semitic, 1 *b* (i).

Spirants, 6 *n*, 13, 21.

Square character, 5 *a*.

Status absolutus of the noun, 89 *a*.

Status constructus, its form, 89:

vowel-changes marking it in many nouns, 91-6: its use, 128: before an adjective treated as a subst., 128 *w*, 133 *h* (end), 134 *p* (end): wider use of it, 130: before prepositions, 130 *a*: before relative clauses, 130 *c, d*: in apposition with another constr. st., 130 *e, f*: before numerals, 134 *o, p*: anomalously with the article, 127 *f-i*: before הַ, used as a relative, 138 *g* (*a*).

Stem-consonants, or radicals, 30 *c*.

Stems, distinguished from roots, 30 *a, d, g-k*.

Strengthening (doubling or sharpening) of consonants, 12, 20: in gutturals, 22 *b*: virtual, 22 *c*: to intensify the idea of the stem, 52 *a, d*: of 3rd radical in fem. and plur. of nouns of the forms מִן, מִן, 84 *a, h*, 93 *s, ee, kk*, 94 *c, 95 g, cf. 93 pp*: virtual sharpening of נ, 64 *e*: sharpening sometimes omitted in 2nd radical of verbs פִּי, 67 *g, dd*.

Subject, omitted in participial clauses, 116 *s, t*: impersonal, 144 *b, c*: indefinite, 144 *d-k*: two subjects in a verbal clause, 144 *l, m*: construction of compound subjects, 146.

Substantive, its construction with the adjective, 132: as predicate of a noun-clause, 141 *b*: used as predicate where we should use an adjective, 141 *c-d*.

Suffixes, (pronominal) attached to verbs, 58: rare, irregular, or poetic, with verb, 58 *g, i, k* (cf. 59 *e-h*, 60 *d-h*, 61 *b-e, g, h*): with noun in sing., 91 *e, f*: in plur. 91 *l*: the sing. form after הַ-, 91 *n*: with prepositions, 103: 3rd sing. masc. in הַ-, 7 *c*, 58 *g*, 91 *e*: 3rd sing. fem. without Mappiq, 58 *g*, 91 *e*, 103 *g*: omission of הַ in fem. nouns before suffix, 91 *e* (end): 3rd plur. in הַ, 58 *g*, 91 *f, l*, 103 *f n*: omission of הַ in plur. nouns before suffix, 91 *k*: original הַ of sing. nouns from הַ stems retained before suffix, 93 *ss*: denoting the remoter object, 117 *x*: use of 3rd fem. sing. and 3rd plur. to express 'it', 135 *p*: anticipating the object (as in Aram.), 131 *m, o*: apparent verbal

forms attached to nouns used as adverbs, 100 *o, p*: anticipating the genitive, 131 *n*: syntax of, 135 *m-r*: heavy (or grave) and light, 59 *e*, 91 *o*, 93 *b*: masculine suffixes referring to feminines, 135 *o*: fem. suff. with collective force, 135 *p*: suffixes which have lost their meaning (הַ, הַ), 135 *g, r*: omitted sometimes with infinitive, 115 *e n*.

Superlative, expression of, 132 *c*, 133 *g-l*.

Sureq, 8 *c*, 9 *n*.

'Surface'-plurals, 124 *b, c*.

Suspended genitive, 130 *e, f*.

Syllables, theory of, 26.

Syncope and elision, 19 *k*, 35 *d*: of the article, 35 *n*: of הַ in Hiph'il and Hoph'al, 53 *a, b*, in infin. Niph., 51 *l*, in infin. Hiph., 53 *g*, in infin. Hoph., 67 *y* (end).

Syriac language, 1 *c*.

Syriasms in pronunciation, 24 *e*: cf. Aramaisms.

Talmud, 3 *a*.

'Tam'-character, 5 *a* (end).

Targums, 1 *c*, 3 *a*.

Tell-el-Amarna tablets, 2 *f*.

Temporal clauses, 106 *f*, 111 *d*, 112 *oo*, 164: expressed by infin. constr. with a preposition, 164 *g*.

Tenses, 40: their use, 106-9, 111, 112: tempus historicum, 106 *d*.

Text of the O. T. probably derived from a single archetype, 3 *c*.

Textual criticism, 3 *g*: intentional and unintentional changes in the text, 3 *g*.

Tiph'el, 55 *h*.

Titles indicated by the feminine form, 122 *r*.

Tone of Hebrew words, 29: marks of, 15 *b, c, k, l*: thrown forward, 29 *e*: retrocession of, 29 *d-g*: incomplete retrocession, 29 *f*: tone in pause, 29 *i-r*: concurrence of two tonesyllables avoided, 29 *e, f, h*. Tone in perfect thrown forward after wāw consec., 49 *h-l*: in imperf. often thrown back in jussive and after wāw consec., 48 *f*, 49 *d*, 67 *x*, 68 *d, e*, 69 *p*, 71, 72 *t, aa*, 73 *e*.

Transitions in poetry from one person to another, 144 *p*, cf. 135 *r*.

Translations of the O. T., 3 *a*.

Transposition (metathesis) of consonants, 19 *n*, 54 *b*.

U-sounds, 8 *c*, 9 *n, o*.

Verb, 38: its syntax, 106-116: its government, 117-121: weak verbs, 41, 66-76, relation to one another, 77: verbs middle *e* and *o*, 43: derivative, *see* Conjugations: denominative, 38 *c*, *d*, 43 *c* (in Qal), 51 *g* (Niph.), 52 *h* (Pi.), 53 *g* (Hiph.), 54 *i* (Hithp.): transitive and intransitive, 43, 117 *u*, *v*: with suffixes, 57-61: doubly weak, 76: נ"ל and ה"ל confused, 75 *nn-rr*: defective, 78: verba induendi et exuendi, 117 *y*: copiae et inopiae, 117 *z*, *aa*: with prepositions, 119: primitive ' retained exceptionally in verbs ה"ל, 75 *u*, *v*, *x*, *dd*, *gg* (end), cf. 29 *t*: verbs ה"ל, 65 *n*, 75 *b* (end): verbs ו"ל, 75 *b*, *v*, *kk*, nouns derived from, 84^a *c* (*e*), *f* (end), *g* (end), 93 *z*. Verbal clauses, 140 *b*, *c*, 142: relative, 155^{f-n}. Verbal ideas subordinated to a verb, 120 *a-c*: co-ordinated with a verb, 120 *d-h*. Verbal suffixes with prepositions (rare), 103 *d*. Verse arrangement of poetic passages, 2 *r* (end). Vocalization of the text, 7 *h*, *i*: Babylonian, 8 *g* *n*, 103 *m* *n*. Vocative with and without the article, 126 *f*. Vowel-letters, 7 *b-g*, 8 *h-m*. Vowel-signs or points, 7 *h*, *i*, 8-10. Vowels, 7: influenced by the nature

of the syllable, 26: firm or unchangeable, 25: changes in them as regards quantity, 27: impure, 25 *c* *n*: pretonic, p. 86 *n*¹, § 102 *f-i*, 103 *c*.

Wāw consecutive, § 49 *a*, *b*, before נ in 1st pers. impf. Pi. with anomalous pathah, 49 *c*, with the perfect, 49 *h-l*, with the imperfect, 49 *c-g*: copulative, punctuation of, 104 *d-g*: wāw apodosis introducing the predicate, 143 *d*: explicative, 154 *a* נ (*b*): concomitantes, 154 ■ נ (*b*): adaequationis, 161 *a* *n*. *See also under* Perfect and Imperfect.

Weak consonants, 6 *s*: נ and ה, 23: ו and י, 24.

Weak verbs, 41, 66-76: their relation to one another, 77: relation between נ"ל and ה"ל, 75 *nn-rr*.

Weakening (or softening) of consonants, 19 *o*.

Wish, expressed by simple impf., 107 *n*: by cohortative, 108 (with נ, 108 *c*): by jussive, 109 (with נ, 109 *b*), by imperative, 110 *a*: by perf. consec., 112 *aa*: by a noun-clause, 116 *r* *n*, 141 *g*: by מי, 151 *a*: by מי יתן, 151 *b-d*: by אם, ל, לי, 151 *e*.

Writing, Semitic, 1 *k*, *l*: old Hebrew, 2 *d*, *i*, 5 *a*: its origin, 5 *g*.

Zenjirli, inscriptions, 1 *m*, 32 *k* *n*.

II

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS AND FORMS

The numbers refer to the sections : the 'superior' figures after the letters refer to the notes. Doubtful forms are marked ? Corrupt forms with †.

א as consonant
and guttural 6 c, 22; qui-
escent 23 a-i; prosthetic
19 m

אב 96
אב 68 b
אבד 50 e, 93 qg
אבדה 85 v
אבה 68 b, 76 d
אבוא ? 23 i
אבותיהם 91 n
אבחר 10 g³
אבי 74 k, 76 h
אבי for לו 159 cc
אבדה 68 i
אביר 84^b f
אכל- 93 hh
אנאלתי ? 53 p
אנרות 95 q
אנדה 55 g
אדוש ? 113 w³
אדם without arti-
cle, 125 f, 126 e¹
אדני 87 g, as Qerê
for יהוה 102 m, force of
suffix lost 135 q and note²
אדני בם 21 c
אדנים 124 i, 145 h
אדעך 69 b¹

אדרש ? 51 k
אהב 68 e
אהבו 64 a
אהבו † 55 e
אהה 105 a
אהיה 75 hh
אהל 22 h
אהלה 91 e
אהלים 23 h, 93 r
אהמיה 75 l
אהרנה 63 f
או 104 c, in dis-
junctive questions 150 g,
in indirect questions 150 i,
in conditional sentences
159 cc, in disjunctive sen-
tences 162
אוביל 50 e
אוי 105 a
אווה 105 a
אוויל 84^a o
אוביל 68 i
אולם 92 g
אנלת 84^b c
אניות 93 r
אופן 84^a r
אור 72 c², n
אות 95 n
אותהם 103 b

אותה 103 b
אותכם 103 b
אז 100 i, wi
perf. and imperf. 107
108 g¹
אזור 23 h
אזין 68 i
אזכרה 85 b
אזלת 44 f
אזרה 75 hh
אזרוע 84^a n
אח 96, 105 a
אחד 96
אחד not in cons
st. 130 g
אחדלה 63 f
אחו 1 i
אחוד 75 bb
אחומי 90 k
אחות p. 283
אחוז 64 c
אחוי 64 c
אחפנה 23 f, 75 oo
אחיותה 91 n
אחל 67 y
אחלי, אחלי in wishes 15
אחרי 103 o
אחר 64 d
אחרו 64 h

אָחֵר בֵּן 29 <i>g</i>	אֵל, אֱלִי 103 <i>o</i> , 119 <i>g</i>	אֶתָּה, אַתָּה 16 <i>f</i> ¹ , 105 <i>a</i> , and Additions
אֲחֵרֵינִי 85 <i>u</i>	אֶלְבִּישׁ 35 <i>m</i>	אָתָּה 80 <i>i</i>
אִי island 93 <i>y</i>	אֵלֶּה 9 <i>q</i> , 87 <i>t</i>	אָנֹכִי (Jer 42 ⁶) 32 <i>d</i>
אִי woe! 105 <i>a</i>	אֵלֶּה 20 <i>k</i>	אֲנַחֲמֶךָ (Is 51 ¹⁹) 47 <i>b</i> ¹
אִי not 152 <i>q</i>	אֱלֹהִים pluralis majestatis 124 <i>g</i> and note ² , without article 125 <i>f</i> , with article 126 <i>e</i> ¹ , with the singular 145 <i>h</i> ; with a plural 132 <i>h</i> ² , 145 <i>i</i>	אֲנִי use of, in different books p. 105 note
אִיד 148	אֵלֹת (inf. abs.) 75 <i>n</i>	אָנִי 32 <i>c</i>
אִיכָּה 100 <i>i</i> , 148	אֱלִיכֶם 22 <i>o</i>	אֲנֹכִי (Moab.) 7 <i>d</i> ¹
אִיכָּה 100 <i>i</i>	אֱלִיל 84 ^a <i>o</i>	אֲנִשׁ 96
אִילִיל 70 <i>d</i>	אֱלִימוֹ 103 <i>p</i> ²	אֲסִיפִים 72 <i>aa</i> , 113 <i>w</i> ³
אִימָה 84 ^a <i>g</i>	אֱלִמוֹם 35 <i>m</i>	אֲסִיר 84 ^b <i>f</i>
אִין, אִין connecting	אֱלִמֹדֶד 35 <i>m</i>	אֲסִלֹּחַ 65 <i>b</i>
bj. and predicate 141 <i>k</i> , 2 <i>i-q</i>	אֱלִקִּים? 35 <i>m</i>	אֲסִפָּה 72 <i>aa</i> , 113 <i>w</i> ²
אִין? 150 <i>c</i> ³	אֱלִקְטָה 64 <i>i</i>	אֲסִפָּה 69 <i>h</i> ¹
אִסְרִים 24 <i>f</i> ² , 70 <i>b</i>	אֶל-תַּחַת 119 <i>e</i> ¹	אֲסִפָּה 48 <i>i</i>
אִישׁ 96 (and אִשָּׁה)	אֱלִתִּי 95 <i>n</i>	אֲסִפָּה 48 <i>i</i>
ed distributively 139 <i>b, c</i>	אֵם (אִם-לֹא) in wishes 151 <i>e</i> , in conditional sentences 159 <i>l-v</i> , <i>dd</i> , in double questions 150 <i>e-i</i> , in oaths 149, concessive 160 <i>a</i>	אֲסִפָּה? 68 <i>h</i>
אִישׁוֹן 86 <i>g</i>	אֵם μητρόπολις 122 <i>h</i> ⁵	אֲסִפָּה 19 <i>f</i> , 66 <i>e</i>
אִישִׁי 47 <i>b</i> ¹	אִמָּה 96	אֲסִרָּה 91 <i>k</i>
אִישֶׁר 70 <i>b</i>	אִמָּה 1 <i>h</i>	אֲסִרִּים 71
אִיתִם? 67 <i>p</i>	אִמּוֹן 63 <i>p</i>	אֲעֵנָה 63 <i>f</i>
אִיתֵן 85 <i>b</i> , 133 <i>a</i> ¹	אִמּוֹלִים: 60 <i>d</i>	אֲעֵנָה 63 <i>h</i> ¹
אִף 100 <i>i</i> , uses of 153	אִמִּינוֹן 86 <i>g</i> ¹	אֲעֵנוֹ (Moab.) 75 <i>b</i> ¹
אִבֹּב 85 <i>b</i> , 133 <i>a</i> ¹	אִמֶּנֶת 122 <i>f</i> ¹	אֲעִישָׁה 63 <i>m</i>
אִבֵּל 68 <i>b</i>	אִמֶּר 68 <i>b</i>	אִף 104 <i>c</i> , intensive 153, (אִף...אִף) 154 <i>a</i> ¹ (<i>c</i>)
אִבֵּל- 22 <i>o</i>	אִמֶּר 23 <i>f</i> , 68 <i>c</i>	אִבְיָהֶם 58 <i>a</i> ¹ , 75 <i>mm</i>
אִבֵּל (ptep.) 52 <i>s</i>	אִמֶּר 44 <i>f</i>	אִפָּה 68 <i>b</i> , 76 <i>d</i>
אִבֵּל 91 <i>e</i>	אִמֶּר 67 <i>r</i> , <i>dd</i>	אִפָּה 91 <i>c</i> ¹ , 93 <i>ss</i>
אִבֵּל for אִבֵּלֶךָ 27 <i>q</i> , 68 <i>f</i> , 75 <i>bb</i>	אִן for אִין or אִין 7 <i>f</i>	אִפּוֹ 63 <i>i</i> , 76 <i>d</i>
אִבֵּלֶךָ 61 <i>d</i>		אִפּוֹ 23 <i>i</i>
אִבֵּלֶם 61 <i>d</i>		אִף-כִּי 154 <i>a</i> ¹ (<i>c</i>)
אִבֹּן 100 <i>i</i>		אִפְנִי 93 <i>r</i>
אֵל (אֱלֹהִים) 34 <i>b</i>		אִפְסִם 152 <i>s</i> , 163 <i>c</i>
אֵל- with jussive 9 <i>c</i> , 152 <i>f</i> , forming a negative compound 152 <i>g</i> , standing immediately before a verb 152 <i>h</i>		אִפְקֹד 47 <i>b</i> ¹

אָצֵק 71
 אָקטל 47 *b*
 אָקרא 10 *g*³
 אָרֶה-לִּי 9 *v*, 67 *o*
 אָרְחָם 52 *n*
 אָרְחָתִּי 93 *r*
 אָרִי 93 *x*
 אָרִיזָה 72 *gg*, 75 *dd*
 אָרְפָּה 75 *pp*
 אָרָץ 67 *p*
 אָרְצָה 90 *f*
 אִשׁ = יִשׁ 47 *b*¹, 114 *l*⁶
 אִשָּׁה 96
 אִשְׁבִּים 53 *k*
 אִשְׁכֶּם 93 *bb*
 אִשְׁעָה 75 *l*
 אִשְׁקָה 20 *m*
 אִשְׁקָה 10 *h*, 48 *c*
 אִשֵּׁר as relative
 pron. 36, its syntax 138,
 in relative clauses 155,
 introducing obj.-clause
 157 *c*, after יַעַן, עַל, &c.
 158 *a*, hypothetical (rare)
 159 *cc*, introd. temporal
 clauses 164 *d*, final 165 *b*.
 consecutive 166 *b*, with
 prepositions forming con-
 junctions 104 *b*; אִשֵּׁר לְ for
 the genitive 129 *h*
 אִשְׁרֵי 84 *b* *g*
 אִשְׁרֵיךְ 93 *l*
 אֵת, אֶת- 103 *b*, syntax
 of 117 *a-m*; before an un-
 determined noun 177 *d*; not
 denoting accus. 117 *i-m*
 אֵת 20 *l*, 32 *h*; as
 masc. 32 *g*
 אֵת = אֶתָּה 32 *g*
 אֶתָּה 75 *rr*

אֶתָּה 76 *d*
 אֶתְּהֶם 103 *b*
 אֶתְּהֶן 103 *b*
 אֶתְּחַבֵּר 54 *a*²
 אֲנִי, אֲנִי 32 *h*
 אֲנִי 29 *t*, cf. 75 *u*
 אֲנִי מְרַחֵק 20 *f*
 אֲנִי 32 *i*
 אֲנִי 75 *rr*
 אַ preposition
 102; punctuation of 102
d, k, m; with suffixes
 103 *g*; senses of 119 *h-q*;
 אַ essentiae 119 *i*; אַ par-
 titive 119 *m*; אַ pretii,
 119 *p*; אַ instrumenti with
 the object 119 *q*
 אֲבָא ? 72 *o*, 76 *g*,
 152 *x*
 בְּאֵלִים 20 *g*
 בְּאֵנִי 9 *v*
 בְּבִדּוֹ 61 *b*
 בְּנִדִּי 93 *k*
 בְּנִדְתָּה 44 *g*
 בְּדָאם 74 *i*
 בְּדִיל 84 *a* *o*
 בְּהִלּוֹ 67 *p*
 בְּהִן 22 *h*
 בְּהִנּוֹת 93 *r*
 בְּהִרְגַּ 51 *l*
 בְּהִשְׁמָה 67 *y*
 בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתִי ? 75 *kk*
 בּוֹא 76 *g*
 בּוֹדָאם 23 *c*
 בּוֹטָה 75 *qq*
 בּוֹסִים 72 *p*
 בּוֹשְׁשֶׁכֶם ? 61 *e*
 בּוֹ 72 *dd*
 בּוֹהַ לָּךְ 72 *l*

בּוֹרֵעַ 20 *g*
 בּוֹחִקִי 27 *n*
 בָּחַן 64 *d*
 בָּחִקוּ 67 *r*
 בְּחִרְיָאָה 9 *v*
 בְּטָנִים 93 *r*
 בְּטָרָם 107 *c*
 בִּי for בְּעִי ? 19 *k*
 as interjection 105 *b*
 בִּיהֶנָּה 102 *m*
 בִּין 73 *a*
 בִּין 103 *o*
 בִּינוֹתָנִי 103 *p*¹
 בִּינִי ? 103 *o*
 בִּינִיךְ ? 103 *o*
 בִּין תְּבִין 73 *d*
 בִּילְתִּי 73 *a*
 בִּית 96
 בִּכָּה 103 *g*
 בְּבוֹרָה ? 91 *e*
 בְּבַל אֲנִישִׁים 127 *c*²
 בְּבָשְׁלוּ 51 *l*
 בְּבָתָּה ? 93 *hh*
 בֵּל 152 *t*
 בָּלָה ? 19 *k*²
 בְּלוֹאִי 93 *x*
 בְּלוֹי 8 *k*
 בְּלִי 152 *t*
 בְּלִיעַל 81 *d*
 בְּלִיעַרִי 99 *e*
 בְּלִיתִי with inf
 constr. 114 *s*, with an a-
 jective 152 *t*; לְבִלְתִּי *t*
 ... not, with infin. 114
 with impf. 152 *x*; (אֵם) *תי*
 except, 163 *c*
 בָּם 23 *k*
 בָּמוֹ 103 *k*

N n 2

tuation 35, syntax 126:
see Article in Index I

interrog. 100,
origin and pointing 100
i-n, uses of 150; אָם... 150 *h*

— (with the tone),
ending of fem. nouns 80 *c*

— (toneless), end-
ing of the Cohortative and
Imperative 48 *c, d*; an old
case-ending 90 *a-i*

— 3rd masc. sing.
pronominal suffix 91 *e*

— (without Map-
piq) anomalous 3rd fem.
sing. pronom. suff. 91 *e*

הָא 105 *b*

הָאִנְכָה (Mi 6¹¹) 47 *b*¹

הָאִנְיָהוּ 53 *g*

הָאִנְיָה 35 *d*

הָאִח 105 *a*

הָאִישׁ one, 144 *d*¹

הָאֵל בֵּית־אֵל 127 *f*¹

הָאֵלֶּה 65 *e*

הָאֵרֶן 35 *o*

הָבָאָה 74 *g*

הָבָאָה 74 *d*

הָבָאָה 72 *w*

הָבָה 105 *b*

הָבִיא 72 *y*, 74 *l*

הָבִישׁוֹתָהּ 78 *b*

הָבִישׁ 72 *x*, 78 *b*

הַבְּמֹת זֹאֵת (Moab.) 80 *f*¹

הָבִירוּ 67 *t*

הָבִרְכָה 10 *g* (end)

הָבִרְכָה 16 *g*

הָבִנָה *Q^{er}* for הָבִנָה

118 *e*²

הָבָה 69 *w*

הָבָה 75 *n*, *aa*

הָבִרְכָה 93 *r*

הָבִישׁ 72 *v*

הָבִירָה הָתְלוֹן 127 *f*¹

הָבִישָׁה 54 *h*

הָבִימִיר 72 *e*

הָבִלְכָתִי 90 *n*

הָבִלָה 52 *s*

הָבָה, הָיָה 32 *k*; הָוָה with

Q^{er} הָיָה 17 *c*, הָוָה as fem.,

not an archaism 32 *l*

הָבָה (הָיָה, הָבָה) =

ipse or *idem* 135 *a*¹, demon-

strative 136, for the copula

141 *h*, resuming the sub-

ject 145 *u*³, in questions

136 *e* (end), 150 *l*

הָוָה 75 *hh*

הָוִישׁ 72 *x*

הָוִיעַ 69 *w*

הָוִי 105 *a*

הָוִיחַ 65 *f*

הָוִירָת 71

הָוִירָת 86 *l*

הָוִירָת פָּעַם 29 *f*

הָוִירָת? 72 *ee*¹

הָוִירָת? 69 *v*

הָוִירָת 74 *l*

הָוִירָתָהּ 59 *h*

הָוִירָת 65 *f*

הָוִירָת? 80 *i*

הָוִירָת 67 *y*, 72 *ee*

הָוִירָת 54 *d*

הָוִירָת 53 *l*

הָוִירָתָהּ 75 *oo*

הָוִירָת 75 *pp*

הָוִירָתִי 63 *k*

הָוִירָתִי 35 *f*, 27 *q*

הָוִירָת 67 *t*

הָוִירָת 74 *k*, 75 *ii*

הָחִינִים 35 *f*

הָחִירִימִים 35 *f*

הָחִירָה 90 *f*

הָחִירָת 67 *w*

הָחִירָה 27 *q*

הָיָה 32 *k*

הָיָה 16 *f*, 63 *q*, 75

with participle 116 *r*, wit

ל before infin. 114 *h-k*, a

copula 141 *g-i*. Cf. הָיָה.

הָיָה 75 *n*

הַיּוֹם = one day

126 *s*

הַיּוֹם שְׁלֹשָׁה 134 *o*¹

הַיּוֹם 113 *k*

הַיּוֹם 9 *i*, 85 *c*

הַיּוֹם? 69 *x*, 78 *b*

הַיּוֹם? 90 *f*

הַיּוֹם 69 *v*

הַיּוֹם 70 *e*

הַיּוֹם 24 *f*², 70 *b*

הַיּוֹם 75 *m*¹

הַיּוֹם (inf. abs.) 75

הַיּוֹם 150 *d*, *e*

הַיּוֹם 72 *z*

הַיּוֹם 75 *mm*

הַיּוֹם 53 *p*

הַיּוֹם 72 *w*

הַיּוֹם expressing

assurance 150 *e*

הַיּוֹם 69 *w*, 71

הַיּוֹם 34 *f*

הַיּוֹם 34 *f*

הַיּוֹם 34 *f*

הַיּוֹם inflexion

69 *x*, use of, to express con-

tinuance 113 *u*

הַיּוֹם 69 *m*²

הַיּוֹם? 23 *i*

הִלַּכְתִּי 44 <i>h</i>	הִנֵּחוּ 72 <i>ee</i>	הִרְבִּית 75 <i>ff</i>
הִלְלוּ 10 <i>g</i>	הִנְנוּ 10 <i>g</i>	הִרְדִּיפְהוּ 20 <i>h</i> ¹ , 22 <i>s</i>
הִלֵּם 50 <i>e</i>	הִנָּנוּ 58 <i>k</i>	הִרָה 27 <i>q</i> , 93 <i>aa</i>
הִלְתַּחֵם (Moab.) 54 <i>l</i>	הִנְנִי 10 <i>g</i>	הִרוּ 75 <i>n</i> , <i>aa</i>
הִם, הִפּוּ, 32 <i>m</i> , for the minine, 32 <i>n</i>	הִנָּפֶת 72 <i>k</i>	הִרְחַק 29 <i>q</i> , 64 <i>h</i>
הִפְאוֹת 97 <i>g</i>	הִנָּקוּ 66 <i>f</i>	הִרְחַק 64 <i>h</i>
הִפּוּ its Dageš 20 <i>k</i>	הִם 105 <i>a</i>	הִרְיוֹתִי 84 <i>g</i>
הִמוֹנָה 91 <i>e</i>	הִפֵּן 72 <i>ee</i>	הִרִים 72 <i>ee</i>
הִמוּשֵׁב in close con- exion 72 <i>bb</i> , 93 <i>pp</i> , cf. 5 <i>d</i>	הִסוּרִים 35 <i>d</i>	הִרְפוּ 67 <i>t</i> , 72 <i>dd</i>
הִמְיִשְׁנִי 67 <i>v</i>	הִסִּין 72 <i>ee</i>	הִרְפִּים 35 <i>d</i>
הִפְכוּ 67 <i>y</i>	הִפִּית 72 <i>ee</i>	הִרְנִין 67 <i>cc</i>
הִפְלִיטִי 29 <i>o</i> ²	הִפְתָּה 72 <i>w</i>	הִרְעוּ 67 <i>v</i>
הִמְנִשָּׁה 125 <i>d</i> ¹	הִעֲבֵרְתָּ 63 <i>p</i>	הִרְעֻמָּה 22 <i>s</i>
הִפֵּם 67 <i>t</i>	הִעוּרִים 35 <i>g</i>	הִרְרִי 90 <i>n</i>
הִמְסִיו 75 <i>ii</i>	הִעוּבִים 35 <i>g</i>	הִרְרִי 93 <i>aa</i>
הִמְסִלָּה (Moab.) 80 <i>f</i> ¹	הִעוּבָת 35 <i>g</i>	הִרְרִי 93 <i>aa</i>
הִמְעֵד 64 <i>h</i>	הִעֻזָּה 67 <i>dd</i>	הִרְרִיה 93 <i>aa</i>
הִמְעִיט 133 <i>c</i> ³	הִעֲלָה 63 <i>p</i>	הִרְרָם 93 <i>aa</i>
הִמְצַרְעִים 10 <i>g</i>	הִעֲלָה 63 <i>p</i>	הִשְׁמִיט ? 73 <i>a</i>
הִמְרוֹת 75 <i>ff</i>	הִעֲרַב 113 <i>k</i>	הִשְׁמִיקוּ 66 <i>e</i>
הִפְשִׁחִית 126 <i>m</i> ¹	הִעֲרִכִים 35 <i>g</i>	הִשְׁמִיר 67 <i>v</i>
הִמְתָּה 72 <i>w</i>	הִעֲשֹׂו 116 <i>g</i> ¹	הִשְׁעֵרָה 90 <i>i</i>
הִמְתָּם 72 <i>w</i>	הִעֲשִׂים 75 <i>v</i>	הִשְׁאַלְתִּיהוּ 64 <i>f</i>
הִן with suffixes 100 <i>o</i> , 147 <i>b</i> , origin 105 <i>b</i> , = <i>if</i> 159 <i>w</i>	הִעֲתִיר 63 <i>o</i>	הִשָּׁב 29 <i>q</i> , 72 <i>y</i>
הִגֵּד 76 <i>a</i>	הִפִּיר 67 <i>v</i>	הִשָּׁבַע 65 <i>e</i>
הִגָּה with suffixes 100 <i>o</i> , 147 <i>b</i> , origin 105 <i>b</i> , with ptep. of present time 16 <i>n</i> ; more often of future time 116 <i>p</i>	הִפְפִּי 61 <i>a</i>	הִשְׁבַּעְתָּנוּ (fem.) 59 <i>h</i>
הִגָּה 20 <i>k</i>	הִפְלֵא 75 <i>oo</i>	הִשְׁכֵּם 113 <i>k</i>
הִגֻּקָּה 85 <i>c</i> (A dit.)	הִפְצַר 29 <i>q</i> , 53 <i>l</i>	הִשְׁמָה 67 <i>y</i>
הִפָּח 72 <i>ee</i>	הִפֵּר 29 <i>q</i> , 67 <i>v</i>	הִשְׁמַם 67 <i>cc</i>
הִנָּחַת 64 <i>h</i>	הִצָּג ? 113 <i>d</i> ²	הִשַּׁע 75 <i>gg</i>
הִנִּיחַ, הִנִּית 72 <i>ee</i>	הִצְטִיר 72 <i>m</i>	הִשְׁעִנִּי 7 <i>f</i>
	הִקְלַתְנִי 67 <i>w</i>	הִשְׁפּוֹת 35 <i>d</i>
	הִשְׁמַם ? 29 <i>g</i>	הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה 75 <i>kk</i>
	הִקְמַתוֹ 72 <i>w</i>	הִתְנוּ : 29 <i>q</i> , 67 <i>v</i> , 72 <i>dd</i>
	הִקְשִׁיבָה 10 <i>g</i>	הִתְחַבְּרוּחַ 54 <i>k</i>
	הִרְאִיתִם 22 <i>s</i>	הִתְרוּ 68 <i>i</i>
	הִרְבָּה 113 <i>k</i>	הִתְיַחֵשׁ ? 64 <i>i</i>
	הִרְבָּה 75 <i>ff</i>	הִתְלַחַת 67 <i>dd</i>
	הִרְבָּה 75 <i>ff</i>	

הַתְּמַחֶמֶה? 55 *g*
 הַתְּמַךְ 67 *v*
 הַתְּנַבּוֹת 75 *qg*
 הַתְּנַבִּית 75 *qg*
 הַתְּפַקְדוֹ 54 *l*
 הַתְּפַקְדוֹ 54 *l*
 הַתְּרָאָה פְּנִים 156 *c*¹
 הַתְּרַחֲצוּתִי 64 *d*
 ! as a vowel-letter 5 *b*¹, 7 *b-g*, 8 *h-m*, 9 *n-s*, its changes 24, initial 26 *a*; a firm consonant in verbs ע"ו 72 *gg*, in verbs orig. ל"ו 75 *a, b, kk*, cf. in nouns 93 *x*
 ! pointing of 104 *d-g*, connecting sentences 154, = *and that*, or *and especially* 114 *p*, 154 *a*¹ (*b*), introducing predicate 143 *d*; ! introducing predicate 111 *h*, or apodosis (rare) 111 *q*, 159 *o* (*e*), *s* (*f*). 143 *d*; ! with perf. introducing predicate or apodosis 112 *ff-oo*, 143 *d*, 159 *o, s*. See also Wāw in Index I.
 וְאֶבְרָךְ 23 *d*, 68 *k*
 : וְאֶבְרַכְם 60 *d*
 וְאֶנְגַּשׁ 49 *c*
 וְאֶרְנִי 23 *d*, 26 *g*, 102 *m*, 104 *d*
 וְאֶזְכְּרָה 53 *n, g*, 68 *i*
 וְאֶחָיו 68 *e*
 וְאֶחָלְלָךְ 111 *w*¹
 וְאֶחָר 64 *h*, 68 *e*
 וְאֶחָרֵי שָׁחַ 113 *e*³
 וְאֶחָשְׁבָה 49 *e*
 וְאֶחָלָה? 49 *e*

וְאָכַל 68 *e*
 וְאָכְלָה 49 *e*
 וְאָכַסְךָ 49 *c*
 וְאַל- = *rather than* 133 *b*²
 וְאַלְךָ 69 *p*
 וְאַלְהִים 102 *d*, 104 *d*
 וְאַסְחַבְהָ (Moab.) 7 *c*
 וְאַעֲיֶדָה? 49 *e*
 וְאַקִּים 49 *e*, 72 *t*
 וְאַקְרָאָה? 48 *d*
 וְאַרְבַּ 75 *gg*
 וְאַרְצָן 29 *i*¹
 וְבִטָן 104 *g*
 וְדִינוּם 73 *b*
 וְהֶאֱנִיחוּ 53 *g*
 וְהֶבִיאֲתִי 76 *h*
 וְהִנֵּלָה 75 *ee*
 וְחוֹשְׁבוֹתִים? 72 *x*
 וְהַחֲמַתִּי 67 *dd*
 וְהַטַּלְתִּי 72 *k, w*
 וְהִיא in prophetic style 112 *y, z*
 וְהִיא 28 *b*
 וְהִי 28 *b*
 וְהִיטַבְתִּי 70 *e*
 וְהִייתֶם 63 *q*, 104 *f*
 וְהַמְטַרְתִּי (Am 4⁷) 112 *h*³
 וְהַמְתִּי 72 *w*
 וְהַמְתִּיהָ 72 *w*
 וְהַמְתֵּן 72 *w*
 וְהַנִּיחָה? 72 *ee*
 וְהַנִּפְתָּ 72 *w*
 וְהַצִּיתָהּ 71
 וְהַצִּירְתִּי 67 *ee*
 וְהַקָּאֲתוֹ 76 *h*
 וְהַקְדִּישְׁנוּ 29 *l*
 וְהַקְמִנוּ 72 *i*
 וְהַרְאִיתִי 53 *p*, 75 *ee*

וְהַשִּׁיבֹתֶם 72 *i*²
 וְהַתְּשׁוּטְטָנָה 54 *b*
 וְהִבַּ 16 *e*, 104 *e*
 וְהִי 104 *g*
 וְהִטָּאת (Ex 5¹⁶) 74 *g*
 וְהִי? 76 *i*
 וְהִי 76 *i*
 וְהִיבֹתֶם 72 *m*
 וְהִיָּה 67 *k*
 וְהִיָּה with *ē* for 28 *b*, 63 *q*, 104 *f*, in pauses sometimes וְהִיָּה 75 *n*
 וְחֲנַתִּי 67 *ee*
 וְיָאֵל 76 *d*
 וְיָאֵמַר (in Jb) 68 *e*
 וְיָאִסְף 68 *h*
 וְיָאֵסַר 23 *b*
 וְיָאֲצֵל 23 *d*, 68 *e*
 וְיָאֵת 23 *d*
 וְיָבִיא 74 *l*
 וְיָבֵךְ 75 *q*
 וְיָבִירָךְ 64 *g*
 וְיָבִישָׁהוּ 69 *u*, 70 *e*
 וְיָבִיחַ 69 *u*
 וְיָבִיל 67 *p*
 וְיָבִישָׁה 7 *c*
 וְיָבִיקוּ 53 *n*
 וְיָדוּ 69 *u*
 וְיָדְרָכּוּ 53 *n*
 וְיִהְיֶה 102 *m*
 וְיִהִי 104 *f*
 וְיִהִי 16 *g*; as narrative formula 111 *f-*
 וְיִהְיֶה שָׁם 29 *g*
 וְיִחַלְלֵה 67 *y*
 וְיִזְחַר? 68 *i*
 וְיִזְעַץ 64 *b*
 וְיִזְצִיא 74 *l*
 וְיִזַּ 75 *r*

וְיָזַח ? 75 r, 76 b	וְיָעָרָו 75 cc	וְלָכְפוּ 73 d
וְיִזְבַּח 65 e	וְיָפַר 67 w	וְיִן— in perfect
וְיִחַק בּוֹ 29 g	וְיָפַתְּ 75 q	(rare) 44 l; in imperfect
וְיִחַטֵּא 74 l	וְיִצְלַח 65 f	47 m, n; less frequent with
וְיַחֲיִי 16 g	וְיִצָּק 7 i	wāw consec. 49 d ¹ . Cf.
וְיִחַלֵּא 75 rr	וְיִצַּק 7 i	וְיִן—
וְיִחַלּוּ (Ho 8 ¹⁰)? I I I w ¹	וְיִקְדֹּר 67 g	וְיִנְאֲשָׁא 64 i
וְיִחַלּוּ 24 e	וְיִקְדֹּר 67 g	וְיִנְיָרִם ? 69 r, 76 f
וְיִחַלְפָה (Moab.) 7 c	וְיִקְרָא 7 i	וְיִנְעֵל I I 2 tt ¹
וְיִחַלְקֵם ? 63 n	וְיִרְאָה 75 q	וְיִנְעֵמִיד 49 e ²
וְיִחַמּוּ 69 f	וְיִרְאוּ הַמּוֹרֵאִים 75 rr	וְיִנְעֵשָׂה 75 h h
וְיִחַמְנָה 69 f	וְיִרְבֶּה 68 i	וְיִנְשׁוּב 49 e ²
וְיִחַן 75 r	וְיִרְדֶּה 75 q	וְיִנְשִׁים 67 y
וְיִחַר 75 r	וְיִרְיִבּוֹן 49 d ¹	וְיִנְשַׁפְּחַת 44 f
וְיִט 75 r	וְיִרְם 27 o, 67 o;	וְיִנְשַׁקָּה ? 19 k ²
וְיִטְמִנוּ 47 i	with accus. I 2 I d ²	וְיִנְשַׁתְּעָה 75 l
וְיִיחַל 69 t	וְיִרְפוּ 75 qq	וְיִעְצֹר 28 b, 104 d
וְיִיף 76 f	וְיִרְפוּ 23 f, 75 qq	וְיִעְתָּר 104 g
וְיִיָּצֵר 7 i	וְיִרְשׁוּד 69 s	וְיִפְשִׁחֵם 44 d
וְיִישֵׁם 53 u, 73 f	וְיִרְשָׁה 69 s	וְיִצְמַח 75 qq
וְיִיבּוֹ 60 d	וְיִרְשָׁתָּה 44 d	וְיִקְדָּמָה 104 g
וְיִפְסֵם-שָׁם 58 g	וְיִרְשָׁתֶם 44 d	וְיִקֹּץ 8 k
וְיִכְנֶנּוּ 72 cc	וְיִשָּׁב 26 p ² , 75 q	וְיִקְצָתָה 67 ee
וְיִכְתּוּ 67 g, y	וְיִשְׁבָּתֶם 69 k	וְיִרְאִינָה 75 n
וְיִלְדָּתָ ? 80 d, 94 f	וְיִשְׁנּוּ 60 d, 75 bb,	וְיִרְצָאתִי 75 rr
וְיִלְלַת 24 e	I 3 I m ³	וְיִשְׁבַּת 44 f, 72 o
וְיִלָּן 72 ee	וְיִשְׁעֵכֶם ? 65 f	וְיִשְׁבָּתִי (ψ 23 ⁶)? 69 m ¹
וְיִמְלֵאוּם 60 h	וְיִשְׁרֵם 69 u	וְיִת— nouns ending
וְיִנָּח 72 ee	וְיִשְׁרָנָה 7 i	in 86 k, 95 t, plur. of 95 u
וְיִסָּב 67 y	וְיִשָּׁת 75 q	וְיִתְאַרְנָה 72 k
וְיִסְבּוּ 67 g	וְיִשְׁתָּחוּ 75 kk	וְיִתְבָּאֵת 76 h
וְיִסְדֶּה 67 p, 73 f	וְיִתָּא 68 h	וְיִתְבָּאֵתִי 48 d
וְיִסְרִי 59 h	וְיִתָּו 75 bb	וְיִתְבַּהֲיָנָה 47 l
וְיִעַט 72 ff	וְיִתְמַהֲמָה 55 g	וְיִתְהִם 72 h
וְיַעֲנוּ (Moab.) 75 b ²	וְיִתְמוּ 67 g	וְיִתְקַבֵּל 69 r
וְיַעַף 72 t	וְיִתְקַשׁ בּוֹ 29 g	וְיִתְנִי-שָׁם 75 ii
וְיַעֲקֹבֵנִי 63 m	וְיִלָּא 104 g	וְיִתְנִי-וְיִתְנִי 23 f,
וְיַעֲקֹבֵנִי ? 53 n	וְיִלְכָה 73 d	68 k
		וְיִתְחַבֵּא 74 l
		וְיִתְחַזֵּק 23 f

וּתְחַלְקֵם 63 *m*
 וַתַּחֲשׁ 72 *ff*
 וַתִּיפֵי 76 *f*
 וְתַלְוֶשׁ ? 72 *t*
 וַתְּמוֹנְנוּ 72 *cc*
 וַתִּנְקְחוּ 70 *e*
 וַתַּעֲגֹב 63 *m*
 וַתַּעֲט 72 *ff*
 וַתַּעֲצֹר 65 *e*
 וַתַּצְפִּנוּ 60 *d*
 וַתִּקְרְבוּ ? 60 *a*¹
 וַתֵּרָא 75 *p*
 וַתִּרְץ 27 *o*, 67 *p*
 וַתִּשְׁלִימוּן ? 58 *g*
 וַתִּתְצַב + 71
 וְ (Moab.) for וְהָ 7 *d*¹
 זֶאת 34, use of 136
 זֶה 34, use of 136;
 enclitic 136 *e, d*; = *here*
 or *now* 136 *d*; as a rela-
 tive 138 *g*
 זָהָב 82
 זֶה, זֹה 34 *b*
 זוֹ demonstr. pron.
 34 *d*; relat. pron. 138 *g*
 זוֹהָרָה 73 *d*
 זִיקוֹת 20 *n*
 זָכָו 67 *ee*
 זַמְמִית 67 *aa*
 זִמְרָה 52 *p*
 זִמְרָה ? 80 *g*
 זִנְכוֹת 93 *ee*
 זִעִיר 86 *g*¹
 זִעְמָה 63 *p*, 64 *c*
 זַעַת 95 *e*
 זָרִי 67 *m*
 זִרְמוֹ 55 *b*

ח with dageš f.
 implicitum 22 *c*
 חָבִי 75 *qq*
 חֲבִלָּהוּ 63 *l*
 חֲבִלְתָּךְ 59 *g*¹
 חֲבֵרְתּוֹ 84^b *g*
 חָנָא 95 *d*
 חֲנוּי 93 *x*
 חָנִי 67 *ff*
 חֵד (אֶחָד) 96
 חֲדָלוּ 20 *i*
 חֲתֻחִים 93 *w*
 חוּטָא 75 *oo*
 חוֹל תַּחִיל ? 73 *d*
 חוֹמֹתַיִם 95 *o*
 חוֹנִי 27 *n*
 חוֹרִי 86 *i*, 87 *g*
 חוֹתֵם 84^a *r*
 חוֹטָל 23 *k*¹
 חוֹהָה (2S24¹¹)? 93 *rr*
 חוֹיִר 84^a *o*
 חוֹיִר 84^a *o*
 חוֹקָה 45 *d*
 חוֹקִי 93 *ee*
 חוֹטָאִים 23 *c*, 74 *i*,
 75 *oo*
 חִטּוֹ 75 *qq*
 חִי יְהוֹת, חִי נִפְשֶׁךְ 93 *aa*¹,
 149 *a*¹, *c*
 חִי אֲנִי 32 *c*
 חֵה what forms
 take Metheg 16 *f*, pointing
 of 63 *q*, shortened forms of
 in imperfect 75 *s*, perfect
 forms as if from חֵי 76 *i*
 חִיצוֹן 27 *w*
 חֵית ? 80 *f*
 חֵיתוֹ 90 *o*
 חֲבִי 23 *l*, 75 *aa*, *hh*
 חֲבִמוֹת 86 *l*

חָלָב 93 *dd*
 חֲלוּנִי 87 *g*
 חֲלוּתִי הִיא 67 *r*
 חֲלִילָה 105 *b*
 חָלָל 67 *cc*
 חֲלַכְאִים ? 93 *x*
 חָם 96
 חָמָה 23 *f*
 חֲמוּטָל 90 *k*
 חֲמוּתִי 67 *ee*
 חֲמָלָה, חֲמָלָה 45 *b*
 חֲמָשִׁי 98 *a*
 חֲמִשָּׁת 94 *f*
 חֲמִשָּׁת עֶשְׂרִי 97 *e*
 חֲמִשָּׁתִּי 91 *l*
 חֲנוּת 67 *r*
 חֲנָה 91 *e*
 חֲנָם 118 *q*
 חֲנִי 67 *a*
 חֲנָנִי 20 *b*, 63 *l*,
 67 *cc*
 חֲסָדִי 93 *m*
 חֲסִידָה 82
 חֲצוֹ 91 *k*
 חֲצוּצָר 55 *e*
 חֲצוּצָרָה 55 *e*, 84^b *n*
 חֲצָצִיד 93 *bb*
 חֲקָךְ 93 *bb*
 חֲקָכֵם 93 *bb*
 חֲקָמִי 10 *g*, 93 *bb*
 חֲרָבוֹ 46 *d*
 חֲרָבִי 63 *l*
 חֲרָדָת 95 *g*
 חָרֹו 67 *ee*
 חָרָשׁ 84^b *b*
 חֲשׁוּפִי ? 87 *g*
 חֲשָׁפִי 46 *d*, 63 *l*
 חֲשִׁים 72 *p*
 חֲשָׁמֶל 85 *s*

טאטא 55 <i>f</i>	יֵדֶר 76 <i>a</i>	יִנְקוּת 95 <i>q</i>
טבח 65 <i>b</i>	יֵדֶר 76 <i>a</i>	יִסְקָה ? 50 <i>e</i>
טבח 84 ^b <i>b</i>	יֵדֶה 76 <i>f</i>	יוצֵת 74 <i>i</i>
טוב 72 <i>c, n, 78 b</i>	יֵדוּ 69 <i>u</i>	יִקְשִׁים (ptep.) 52 <i>s</i>
טופפות 19 <i>o, 84^b o</i>	יֵדוּר 67 <i>cc, 76 a</i>	יִרְאָה 69 <i>w</i>
טנא 22 <i>e</i>	יֵדוֹן 72 <i>r</i>	יִרְהֶה 69 <i>r</i>
טָרַם with impf., of	יֵדִי ? 87 <i>f</i>	יושבת 90 <i>n</i>
st time 107 <i>c, of present</i>	יֵדְכֶם 91 <i>k</i>	יִשָּׁדֶר 53 <i>u</i>
ne 152 <i>r</i>	יֵדֵל 67 <i>g</i> (Addit.)	יִשָּׁר 53 <i>u, 73 a</i>
' as a vowel-	יֵדְמוּ 67 <i>g</i>	יִשָּׁת 53 <i>u, 73 a</i>
ter 5 <i>b</i> ¹ , 7 <i>b-g, 8 h-m,</i>	יֵדְמוּ 67 <i>g</i>	יִזְבַּח 65 <i>e</i>
-m, its changes 24, as	יֵדְעָה 44 <i>l</i>	יִזְמוּ 67 <i>dd</i>
tial vowel 47 <i>b</i> ¹ ; orig. '	יֵדְעֵם מִנְּגוֹן 120 <i>b</i> ¹	יִחְבְּלוּ 63 <i>g</i>
ppearing in poet. forms	יֵדְעָתָה 44 <i>i</i>	יִחְבְּרֶה 60 <i>b, 63 m</i>
verbs לָהֶם 75 <i>u, v, dd, gg</i>	יֵדְשָׁנָה ? 48 <i>d</i>	יִחְבֹּשׁ 63 <i>d</i>
יֹאכֵר 53 <i>n</i>	יֵהֵב 69 <i>o</i>	יִחְבֹּשׁ 63 <i>d</i>
יֹאזֵר 72 <i>h</i>	יֵהֵהָה 63 <i>m</i>	יִחַד 28 <i>e</i> ² , 75 <i>r</i>
יֹאחֲזִי 68 <i>b</i>	יֵהֵרָף 63 <i>e</i>	יִחְדוּ 91 <i>k, 93 l,</i>
יֹאחֲזִי 68 <i>b</i>	יֵהוּא 27 <i>w</i>	135 <i>r</i>
יֹאחֲזִיף 64 <i>a</i>	יֵהוּא 23 <i>i, 75 s</i>	יִחוּיוֹן 47 <i>m</i>
יֹאטֵם 63 <i>m</i>	יֵהוּדָה 53 <i>q</i>	יִחְזָקָל 27 <i>q</i>
יֹאכְלִין 68 <i>c</i>	יֵהוּהָה 17 <i>e, its pro-</i>	יִחְזָקוּ 63 <i>g</i>
יֹאמֵר 68 <i>c</i>	nunciation with prefixes	יִחִי 75 <i>s</i>
יֹאסֵף 68 <i>b, h</i>	יֹאמְרוּ ? 102 <i>m; צָבָאוֹת ? 125 h</i>	יִחִי 75 <i>s</i>
יֹאסֵר 26 <i>i, 63 e</i>	יֹהֲבֵל 53 <i>q</i>	יִחִיתָ ? 20 <i>n, 60 d,</i>
יֹאר 1 <i>i</i>	יֹהֲשִׁיעַ 53 <i>q</i>	67 <i>v</i>
יֹאשׁ 64 <i>e</i>	יֹהִי 75 <i>s</i>	יִחְלֹה 20 <i>i</i>
יֹאשְׁמוּ 67 <i>p</i> ²	יֹהִי 9 <i>f, 75 s</i>	יִחֵם 67 <i>g</i>
יֹאתוּ 72 <i>h</i>	יֹהִל 67 <i>p</i>	יִחְמֹתָנִי 64 <i>h</i>
יֹבֹא 72 <i>h</i>	יֹהִל ? 68 <i>k</i>	יִחוּ 53 <i>u</i>
יֹבֹשׁ 72 <i>h</i>	יֹהֲצָה 90 <i>f</i>	יִחְנֶה 60 <i>b, 67 n</i>
יֹבֶרֶר 53 <i>n</i>	יֹיָאֵר 53 <i>u</i>	יִחֲנוּ 67 <i>cc</i>
יֹבֶשֶׁת 69 <i>n, 70 a N</i>	יֹיָדְעָתִי ? 55 <i>b</i>	יִחֵם 72 <i>r</i>
יֹגִיד 53 <i>n</i>	יֹיָדֵשׁ 53 <i>u</i>	יִחְפֹּץ 29 <i>u</i>
יֹנְפֵא 75 <i>oo</i>	יֹיָחֵל 53 <i>u</i>	יִחְצִבּוֹן 51 <i>m</i>
יֹגֵן 67 <i>p</i>	יֹיָכָה 65 <i>f</i>	יִחְקִי 53 <i>u, 67 y</i>
יֹנֵר impf. of 78 <i>b</i>	יֹיָכֵל 53 <i>u, 69 r</i>	יִחַת 66 <i>f</i>
יֹנֵר 67 <i>g</i> (Addit.)	יֹיָלֵד (ptep.) 52 <i>s</i>	יִחְתֶּה 63 <i>m</i>
יֹד 93 <i>mm</i>	יֹיָם 96	יִחְתוּ 20 <i>i</i>
	יֹיָמֵם 100 <i>g</i> ¹	יִטְפֵּא 19 <i>d</i>

יִדַּע 69 *b*¹, *p*
 יִיטִיב 70 *d*
 יִיטִיב 70 *e*
 יִילֵל 70 *d*
 יִיֶּסֶד ? 73 *f*
 יִיקַר 69 *b*¹
 יִיֶּשֶׁר 70 *b*
 יִכְלֶה 75 *qq*
 יִכְלִיתוּ 44 *e*
 יִכְסִימוּ 75 *mm*
 יִכְסִימוּ 75 *dd*
 יִפֹּת 53 *u*, 67 *g*, *y*
 יִלְבֵּב 67 *cc*
 יִלְדִּתִּיךְ 27 *s*, 44 *d*
 יִלְדֹּד 27 *w*, 84^b *e*
 יִלְוֶנוּ 72 *ee*
 יִלְוֶהוּ 72 *ee*
 יִלְזֹן 72 *ee*
 יִלְזֶנּוּ 72 *ee*
 יִלְכֹּד 69 *p*
 יִלְכָּדוּ ? 60 *e*
 יִלְקִטוּ 27 *l*
 יִם ? (Siloam inscr.)
 7 *f*
 יִמָּה (Moab.) 7 *c*
 יִמַּח 75 *y*
 יִמִּים 132 *h*²
 יִפְּחֶה 67 *g*
 יִמְלֹךְ 67 *g*
 יִמְלֶה 23 *e*, 75 *pp*
 יִמְצֵא 75 *hh*
 יִמַּר 72 *dd*
 יִמְרֹדֶה 68 *h*
 יִן — in 2nd sing.
 fem. imperf. 47 *o*; Aram.
 plur. for יִם — 87 *e*.
 יִנְאֵץ 73 *g*
 יִנְהֵל 64 *d*

יִנְטֹר 66 *e*
 יִנִּי 74 *k*, 76 *h*
 יִנִּיחַ 72 *ee*
 יִנְצֹרוּ 66 *f*
 יִנְקֶה 75 *hh*
 יִנְשֹׂא ? 23 *i*, 47ⁿ, 75^{oo}
 יִסַּב (Addit.) 67 *g*
 יִסַּג 72 *dd*
 יִסַּי 72 *ee*
 יִסִּית 72 *ee*
 יִסְפֹּהוּ 67 *o*
 יִסֶּף 69 *h*¹, 78 *c*
 יִסֶּף 68 *b*
 יִסְרָה 52 *p*
 יִסְרָךְ 61 *d*
 יִסְרִי 59 *f*
 יִעֲבֹדוּ 53 *n*
 יִעֲרֹפוּ 72 *cc*
 יִעֲלֶעֶז 55 *f*
 יִעֲזֹב, יִעֲזֹב אֲשֶׁר 107 *q*¹
 יִעֲזֹב וּבִיָּעַן 158 *b*
 יִעֲזֹרוּ ? 72 *cc*
 יִעֲקֹב (verb) 63 *c*
 יִעֲרֹם 63 *m*
 יִעֲשֶׂה 75 *hh*
 יִפְגִּשְׁךָ 10 *g*, 60 *b*
 יִפֹּה forms of 76 *f*
 יִפְהַפִּיחַ 23 *k*¹, 84^b *n*
 יִפֹּחַ 72 *dd*
 יִפְּיִפִּיתִי 55 *e*
 יִפְרֹחַ 65 *e*
 יִפְרִיא 75 *rr*
 יִצֵּא 76 *e*
 יִצֵּא 75 *qq*
 יִצֵּא (אל-) 9 *l*, 69 *p*
 יִצֵּב 71
 יִצַּחֵק 64 *h*
 יִצֹר 71
 יִצְתִּי 23 *f*
 יִקְבֹּד 93 *k*

יִקְדָּעִם 21 *e*¹
 יִקֹּם 72 *r*
 יִקֹּם 72 *t*
 יִקֹּם 72 *h*
 יִקַּח 53 *u*
 יִקְחוּ 20 *m*
 יִקְטֹלֶנָּה 47 *k*
 יִקְסִי-קָזָן 29 *g*
 יִקֹּם (juss.) 72 *t*
 יִקֹּם 53 *u*
 יִקְצֹן forms of 78
 יִקְרָא 93 *ww*
 יִקְרָא 84^a *n*
 יִקְרָא 75 *rr*
 יִקְרָאָהוּ 60 *c*
 יִקְרָאוּ 60 *c*, 74 *e*
 יִקְרָה 75 *rr*
 יִקְשֹׁן 72 *r*
 יִקְתָּאֵל 21 *e*¹
 יִרָא 76 *e*
 יִרָא 75 *hh*
 יִרָא 75 *p*, *q*
 יִרָא 75 *oo*
 יִרָא 93 *ii*
 יִרְאָתָם 74 *g*
 יִרְדֹּ 69 *g*, 75 *bb*
 יִרְדֶּה ? 63 *n*
 יִרְדְּפוּ 60 *d*
 יִרְדְּפֶה 10 *h*
 יִרְהַ forms of 76
 יִרְמוּ 72 *dd*
 יִרְוֶן 67 *p*
 יִרְעֶ 67 *t*
 יִרְוֶן 67 *p*
 יִרְשָׁלַיִם 88 *c*
 יִרְחֹף 52 *n*
 יִרְבְּחִי 95 *i*
 יִרְמֶה 23 *k*
 יִרַע 67 *n*
 יִרַע 67 *n*

יָרֵעִי 67 <i>dd</i>	יָמִין 53 <i>u</i>	בִּיתְרוֹן 24 <i>e</i>
יִשְׂאֵא 75 <i>rr</i>	יִתְּרָה 80 <i>g</i>	בָּכָה 100 <i>i</i>
יִשְׂטָם 75 <i>q</i>	כ for כִּי (Moab.)	בְּבָרִים 88 <i>b</i> , 131 <i>d</i> ²
יִשְׁקָק 66 <i>e</i>	7 <i>d</i> ¹	כָּל (verb ע"י) 73 <i>b</i>
יִשְׁשִׁים? 47 <i>n</i>	כּ its meaning	כָּל used abso-
יִשְׁשָׁר 47 <i>b</i> ¹	102 <i>c</i> ; with suff. 103 <i>h</i> ;	lutely 117 <i>c</i> , with a fol-
יִשׁ meaning 152 <i>i</i> ;	construction of 118 <i>s-w</i> ;	lowing genitive 117 <i>c</i> ,
1 suffixes 100 <i>o, p</i> ;	prepositions often omitted	127 <i>b, c</i> ; construction of
hypothetical sentences	after 118 <i>s-w</i> ; exception-	its predicate, 146 <i>c</i> ; with
159 <i>dd</i> ; in ques-	ally with prep. 118 <i>s</i> ² ; כ	a participle absol. 116 <i>w</i> ;
141 <i>k</i> (with ptcp.)	veritatis 118 <i>x</i> ; omitted in	with a negative 152 <i>b</i>
יִשְׂאֵל 74 <i>l</i>	comparisons 141 <i>d</i> ; not	כָּל־אֲתִי 75 <i>oo</i>
יִשְׂבֹּב 47 <i>b</i> ¹	= בְּאִשֶּׁר 155 <i>g</i>	כָּלָה 91 <i>e</i>
יִשְׂרָם 20 <i>b</i> , 67 <i>cc</i>	בָּאֵר 19 <i>k</i> ²	כָּלָה מִסְלָלִי 61 <i>h</i>
יִשְׂרָד 67 <i>p</i>	בְּאִשֶּׁר 161 <i>b, c</i>	כָּלוּ (= כָּלָאוּ) 75 <i>qq</i>
יִשְׂרִי 47 <i>b</i> ¹	בְּבִחְצִי 118 <i>s</i> ²	כָּלִי 96
יִשְׂרָע 27 <i>x</i>	בָּבָם 52 <i>l</i>	כָּלֶבֶל 72 <i>m</i>
יִשְׂרָם 67 <i>y</i>	בְּבִרְאשְׁתָּהּ 118 <i>s</i> ²	כָּלָנוּ 91 <i>f</i>
יִשְׂרָה 67 <i>g</i>	בְּבִתְחִלָּה 118 <i>s</i> ²	כָּמוֹ 103 <i>k</i>
יִשְׂלָם 53 <i>n</i>	בְּרָכָה 21 <i>d</i>	כָּמוֹנִי 103 <i>h</i> ⁵ , <i>k</i>
יִשְׂם 67 <i>g</i> (Addit.)	כְּהִיֹּם 35 <i>u</i>	כְּמַפְנִי 118 <i>s</i> ²
יִשְׂמַעֲלֵאל 23 <i>c</i>	כְּהִנְדָּף? 51 <i>k</i> , 66 <i>f</i>	כְּמִרְרִים? 84 <i>b</i> <i>m</i>
יִשְׂנָא 75 <i>rr</i>	כּוֹכַב 19 <i>o</i> , 84 <i>b</i> <i>o</i>	כֹּן 100 <i>i</i>
יִשְׂנָא 75 <i>rr</i>	כִּי for כִּי 24 <i>b</i> .	כֹּן־הִיא 20 <i>g</i>
יִשְׂנֹ its suffix 67 <i>o</i> ¹ ;	cf. 93 <i>y</i>	כֹּנִלוֹת 20 <i>h</i> , 53 <i>q</i>
subtful form 100 <i>o</i> ²	כִּי omitted in	כֹּנָם 85 <i>t</i> , 87 <i>h</i>
יִשְׂפֹט 47 <i>g</i>	obj.-clause 157 <i>a</i> , intro-	כֹּנָפוֹת 93 <i>ee</i>
יִשְׂרֹן 86 <i>g</i>	ducing obj.-clause 157 <i>b</i> ,	כֹּסִיל 84 <i>o</i>
יִשְׂרָתִינָה 60 <i>e</i>	introducing direct narra-	כֹּעֶבֶד 35 <i>g</i>
יִתְ— nouns ending	tion 157 <i>b</i> , causal 158 <i>b</i> ,	כֹּעֻפָּרֶת 35 <i>g</i>
67 <i>l</i> , 94 <i>f</i> , 95 <i>t</i>	in conditional clauses	כֹּעֵל 118 <i>s</i> ²
יִתְאוּ 75 <i>bb</i>	159 <i>aa, bb</i> , asseverative	כֹּעֶפֶר 35 <i>n</i>
יִתְאַרְהֵי 64 <i>i</i>	159 <i>ee</i> , adversative and	כֹּפִימוֹ 103 <i>f</i> ³
יִתָּם 67 <i>g</i>	exceptive 163, temporal	כֹּפֶכָה 91 <i>e</i>
יִתָּם 67 <i>g</i>	164 <i>d</i> , consecutive 107 <i>u</i> ,	כֹּפִלִים 134 <i>r</i> ²
יִתְמוֹ 67 <i>g</i>	166 <i>b</i>	כֹּרְמֵל 85 <i>s</i>
יִתֹן 53 <i>u</i> , 66 <i>k</i>	כִּי אֵם 163 <i>a-d</i>	כֹּרֶת 22 <i>s</i> , 64 <i>e</i>
יִתְנַחֵם 27 <i>q</i> , 29 <i>v</i>	כִּילִי 86 <i>i</i>	כֹּרֶתָה 64 <i>e</i>
יִתְפַּקֵּד 54 <i>l</i>	כִּי־עַל־כֵּן 158 <i>b</i> ¹	כֹּרֶתִי 44 <i>o</i>
	כִּי־עֲנִים 35 <i>b</i>	

פְּשִׁיחַ 20 *g*
 פֶּשֶׁל forms of 78 *c*
 פֶּתֶב 25 *c*², a qitāl
 form 84^a *n*, the *ā* un-
 changeable 93 *ww*
 פִּתְבוּנִם 91 *e*
 פִּתְבִּיהֶדָּת 9 *u*
 פִּתְנָת 95 *r*
 פִּתֵּר 65 *e*

לְ preposition

45 *f, g*; pointed לְ 102 *f-i*,
 103 *e, f*; uses of 119 *r-u*;
 reflexive use 119 *s*; intro-
 ducing the object 117 *n*;
 denoting the genitive 129;
 with a passive and with
 passive ideas 121 *f*; לְ in-
 scriptionis 119 *u*; distri-
 tributive 123 *d*; with the
 infinitive 114 *f-s*, "ולְ with
 infin. 114 *p*; = *in respect*
to 143 *e*; perhaps = Arab.
lā, surely 143 *e*.

לֹא origin 100 *a*;
 in prohibitions 107 *o*;
 with the Jussive 109 *d*;
 as negative answer 150 *n*,
 uses of 152 *a-d, u*; nega-
 tive a single idea 152 *a*¹;
 exceptional positions of for
 emphasis 152 *e*; וְלֹא = *in*
order that . . . not 165 *a*;
 וְלֹא forming hypothetical
 sentence 159 *dd*

לֹא written for לוֹ

103 *g*

לֹאֲרִיב 53 *q*

לֹאֲדֹר 51 *l*, 72 *v*

לֹאֲמַ 72 *p*

לֹאֲמֹר 23 *d*

לֹאֲמֹר 28 *b*

לֹבֵד 119 *c*

לְבוֹז 67 *n*

לְבוֹר 67 *r*

לְבִיא 53 *q*, 72 *z*

לְבִיאָה 80 *h*

לְבִלְתִּי with infin.

114 *s*; with impf. 152 *x*

לְבָדָּךְ 93 *dd*

לְבָעֵר קָו 29 *f*

לְבָרֵם 67 *p*

לְרָה 69 *c*

לְרִישׁ 45 *g*

לָהּ 23 *k*, 103 *g*

לְהוֹשִׁיבִי 90 *n*

לְהוֹיֹת 28 *b*

לְהָכִיל 68 *i*

לְהִנָּפֵחַ 72 *z*

לְהִנָּחֵד 66 *f*

לְהַפִּיר 67 *w*

לְהַפְרֹכֵם 67 *dd*

לְהִרְאוֹת 75 *c*

לְהִשׁוֹת 75 *qq*

לְהִשְׁמָעוֹת 53 *l*

לוֹ written for לֹא

103 *g*

לוֹ in wishes, its
 construction 151 *e*; in con-
 ditional clauses 159 *l, m*,
x-z

לוֹא 23 *i*

לוֹט 72 *p*

לוֹיִנֹנִי 91 *k*

לוֹיִתָּן 86 *f*

לוֹלִי, לוֹלִיא formation

27 *w*, in conditional clau

159 *l, m, x-z*

לָחָה 91 *e*

לְחָטִיא 53 *q*

לְחָיִים 88 *b*

לְחָלֶק 53 *q*

לָחֶם 22 *h*

לְחָמֶם 28 *b*, 67 *cc*

לְחִנָּה 67 *cc*

לְחָפֹר פְּרוֹת 84^b *n*

לְשָׁעַת 66 *b*

לְהוֹזָה 102 *m*

לְיֵלָה 90 *f*

לְיִפֹּד 69 *n*, 71

לְיִרְוֹא 75 *rr*

לְיִרְשָׁנוּ 69 *m*

לְ imperative

for לָכָה 48 *i*; as an in-
 jection 105 *b*

לָכָה pronoun,

לָךְ 103 *g*

לָכֹ 105 *b*

לְלֹאוֹת 93 *x*

לְלִבֹּ 53 *q*

לָלָה (Moab.)

לְיֵלָה 7 *f*

לָלַח 19 *d*, 69 *n*

לָמָה, לָמָה, לָמָה, לָמָה

punctuation 49 *f, g*, 10
 in requests or warni
 often nearly = *lest* 150

לָמוֹ 103 *f*³

לָמוֹ 103 *k*

לְמַחוֹת 53 *q*

לְמִיגָהֶם 91 *k*

לָמוֹ 119 *c*²

לָמַעַן 119 c	לְשֹׁמֵר 53 q	uses 137; in exclamations 148
לְמִירוֹת 53 q	לְשֹׁמֵעַ 53 q	מֵהֵיּוֹת 102 b
לְמִשְׁאוֹת 45 e	לְשֶׁרֶת שֵׁם 64 g	מֵהֶלְבִּים ? 53 o
לְנוֹעַ 66 b	לֵת ? 69 m	מֵהֶפְכָּה followed by
לָנָה 80 i	לְתֶחֱרַב 102 f	אֵת 115 d, cf. 45 e
לְנַחֲוֹתָם 53 q	לְתֶתֶן ? 66 i	מֵהֶקְצֻוֹת 53 q
לְנִפְל 53 q, 66 f		מֵהָר (ptcp.) 52 s
לְנִפֶּשׁ 102 i	m as preforma- tive of participles 52 c, sometimes dropped 52 s; of infin. (rare) 45 e; of nouns 85 e-m	מוֹ- verbal suffix 58 g; noun suff. 91 f, l, 103 f ²
לְסִתֵּר 53 q	מֵ- for מֵהֵ- , מֵ- 20 d, 37	מוֹט 72 q
לְעֵבִיר 53 q	מֵאוֹמָה 90 f	מוֹל 72 p
לְעֹז 72 q	מֵאֵן (ptcp.) 52 s	מוֹסֵד 71
לְעִינִים 35 g	מֵאִסְכֶּם 61 d	מוֹסְרוֹת see Additions
לְעֻמָּת 100 b, 101 a	מֵאִסְפִּי 52 p	מוֹטָרָה 52 s
לְעֻנוֹת 51 l	מֵאֵת שֹׁמֵר 29 f	מוֹצֵא 53 o
לְעֹשֶׂר ? 53 k	מֵבֶטֶחַ 92 g	מוֹצֵא 75 oo
לְפָנַי 119 c, 130 a ³	מֵבִי with final א dropped 72 z, 74 k, 76 h	מוֹצֵאָה 95 p
לְצַבָּא 45 g	מֵבִיָּאָה 91 k	מוֹצֵאָת 74 i, 94 f
לְצִבּוֹת 53 q	מֵבִית לִ 130 a ³	מוֹרִגִּים 93 pp
לְצִחָק 29 g	מֵבִלִּי 119 c ²	מֹתָה 90 f
לְצִצִּים 55 f	מֵבַלְעֵרִי 119 c ²	מִזִּין 68 i
לָקַח 66 g	מֵבַעַתָּה 80 d	מִתְּחָה וְהַפֶּךְ 113 h ²
לָקַח 66 g	מֵבַצִּיר for "מֵבִ" 20 m	מִחוּץ 119 c
לָקַח 52 s (ptcp.)	מִבְּיֹרְתָם 20 m	מִתְּחִלָּמִים 53 o
לָקַחָה 10 h, 52 d	מִבְּדוֹן 85 v	מִתְּחִנָּה fem. 122 l ¹
לָקַחִי 66 g	מִגְדֹּלְתָה (Moab.) 91 k ²	מִתְּחִיָּד 93 ss
לָקַחְתָּ 65 g	מִגְנִי 85 f	מִתְּחִי 13 b
לָקַחְתָּ 19 k, 74 h	מִגְרֵשׁ infin. 45 e	מִתְּחִצִּים 53 o
לָרָא ? 69 n	מִגְרֵשָׁה ? 91 k	מִתְּחִשּׁוֹת 95 q
לָרְאוֹת 51 l	מִדְּבָר 19 d, 54 c	מִתְּחִת 80 g
לָרְאוֹתָם 53 q	מִדְּבָרָה 26 h, 67 o	מִתְּחִי 75 kk
לְשִׁטְנוֹ 61 b	מִדָּה ? 91 e	מִי 37; its uses 137
לְשִׁאוֹל 10 g ³	מִדּוֹ 27 s	מִי יִמֵּן in wishes 151 a, d
לְשִׁבִּית 53 q	מִדּוּעַ 99 e	מִיָּהוּה 102 m
לְשִׁלַּח 65 e	מִי, מֵהֵ-, מֵהֵ- 20 d, 37; its	מִים 88 d, 96
לְשִׁלַּשְׁתָּ 134 o ¹		מִיָּמִינִים 24 f ² , 70 b

מִימִין 130 <i>a</i> ³	133 <i>a, b</i> ; = too much or too little for 133 <i>c</i> ; pregnant use in comparisons	מָקוֹם 85 <i>g</i>
מִימִן ? (Siloam inscr.) 7 <i>f</i>	119 <i>ff</i> , 133 <i>e</i>	מִקַּח (infin.) 45
מִירְדִי 69 <i>m</i>	מִן־הוּא 103 <i>m</i>	מִקְנָה 75 <i>qq</i>
מִפְּלֹת 23 <i>f</i>	מִן 37 <i>b</i>	מִקְנִיָּה 93 <i>ss</i>
מִכְרָם 48 <i>i</i> , 61 <i>b</i>	מִנְאִי? 55 <i>b</i>	מִקְנָתִי 90 <i>n</i>
מִכְתָּה 91 <i>k</i>	מִנְדָּר 119 <i>c</i> ²	מִקְרָא (infin.) 45
מִכְתָּךְ 91 <i>n</i>	מִנְהוּ 103 <i>m</i>	מִרְאֵיהֶם 93 <i>ss</i>
מִלָּא 75 <i>oo</i>	מִנִּי plur. apoc.?	מִרְאִיו 93 <i>ss</i>
מִלָּאוּ 74 <i>g</i>	87 <i>f</i> ; poet. for מִן 90 <i>m</i> , 102 <i>b</i> , for מִנְי 103 <i>i</i> (in pause מִנִּי)	מִרְאִיָּה 93 <i>ss</i>
מִלְאוֹת 74 <i>h</i>	מִנִּי twice poet. for מִן 102 <i>b</i>	מִרְבַּע 65 <i>d</i>
מִלְאָה 23 <i>c</i> , 85 <i>g</i>	מִסֵּב 85 <i>h, k</i>	מִרְנוֹן 22 <i>s</i>
מִלְאָכָה 91 <i>e, l</i>	מִסוּרָה 3 <i>b</i>	מִרְדָּה 69 <i>m</i>
מִלְאֹת 75 <i>qq</i>	מִסִּיף? 67 <i>v</i>	מִרְדָּךְ 22 <i>s</i>
מִלְבֹד 119 <i>c</i> ²	מִסְלָאִים 75 <i>rr</i>	מִרְדָּף 102 <i>b</i>
מִלוּ 75 <i>qq</i>	מִסַּע (infin.) 45 <i>e</i>	מִרְחֵק 85 <i>h</i>
מִלּוּכָה 46 <i>e</i>	מִסְתָּר 23 <i>f</i>	מִרְךָ 85 <i>k</i>
מִלוּשָׁנִי 55 <i>b</i> , 90 <i>m</i>	מִעוּז 85 <i>k</i>	מִרְבֶּבָה 85 <i>h</i>
מִלִּין 72 <i>ee</i>	מִעוּנִיָּה? 20 <i>o</i>	מִרְפָּא 75 <i>rr</i>
מִלְכִי 46 <i>d</i>	מִעוּרִים 53 <i>o</i>	מִרְתָּ 22 <i>s</i>
מִלְמַעְלָה 99 <i>e</i> , 119 <i>c</i> ²	מִעֻנּוֹ 90 <i>o</i>	מִשְׁאוֹת (infin.) 45
מִלָּף 68 <i>k</i>	מִעַל־לִי 119 <i>c</i> ²	74 <i>h</i>
מִלְפָּנִי 119 <i>c</i>	מִעֲלָה (infin.) 45 <i>d</i>	מִשְׁאוֹן 85 <i>u</i>
מִלְשָׁנִי 64 <i>i</i>	מִעֲלוֹי 93 <i>ss</i>	מִשְׁחָת? 80 <i>b</i> ²
מִלְתִּי 23 <i>f</i>	מִעַת 133 <i>e</i> ⁴	מִשְׁכּוֹ 46 <i>d</i>
מִמּוֹל 119 <i>c</i> ²	מִפְּנִי 119 <i>c</i>	מִשְׁלֹחַ (Inf.) 45 <i>e</i>
מִמְחִים 75 <i>dd</i> , 93 <i>ss</i>	מִצָּאֵן 74 <i>h</i>	מִשֵּׁם 119 <i>c</i> ²
מִפְּנֵי 103 <i>m</i> , 135 <i>o</i> ³	מִצֵּב 92 <i>g</i>	מִשְׁמִים 67 <i>cc</i>
מִפְּעַל 119 <i>c</i> ²	מִצּוֹתָךְ 91 <i>n</i>	מִשֵּׁק 85 <i>h</i>
מִקְרָם 85 <i>g</i>	מִצֵּל 67 <i>v</i>	מִשְׁקָל 92 <i>g</i>
מִמְתָּקִים 85 <i>g</i> ¹	מִצְפּוֹן לִי 130 <i>a</i> ³	מִשְׁרָת 80 <i>d</i> , 94 <i>f</i>
מִן preposition	מִצְרִים 88 <i>c</i>	מִשְׁרָתִי אֹתִי 116 <i>g</i> ¹
101 <i>a</i> ; its punctuation	מִצְתִּי 23 <i>f</i>	מִשְׁתַּחֲוִיָּהֶם 75 <i>kk</i>
102 <i>b</i> ; with suffixes	מִקְדָּשֵׁיהֶם 93 <i>oo</i> ¹	מִשְׁתִּי, מִשְׁתִּים 97 <i>b</i> ¹
103 <i>i, m</i> ; its meanings	מִקְהָלִים 93 <i>qq</i>	מִשְׁתִּיהֶם 93 <i>ss</i>
119 <i>v-z</i> ; partitive 119 <i>w</i> ² ;		מִת 72 <i>c</i> ² , <i>n</i>
negative force of 119 <i>w-y</i> ;		מִתְשַׁאֵל 90 <i>k</i>
with the comparative		מִתְשַׁלָּח 90 <i>k</i>
		מִתְחַת 119 <i>c</i> ²
		מִתְחַשִּׁים? 64 <i>i</i>

מָתַם 85 <i>k</i>	נָהָה 66 <i>c</i>	נִכְבְּדוֹת 121 <i>d</i> ¹
מָתַן 92 <i>g</i>	נִהְלֵת 64 <i>d</i>	נִכְה forms of 76 <i>c</i>
נ as preforma-	נִהְרִים 88 <i>c</i> , 93 <i>ee</i>	נִכְחַז 27 <i>w</i>
e of nouns 85 <i>n</i>	נִגְנִי 69 <i>t</i>	נִכְרַח 93 <i>gg</i>
נָא 105 <i>b</i> , em-	נִהַם 93 <i>ss</i>	נִכְרַשׁ 29 <i>g</i>
phasizing a cohortative	נִחַ (inf. constr.)	נִלְוֹ (imper.) 51 <i>o</i>
8 <i>b</i> , <i>c</i> , a jussive 109 <i>b</i> , <i>c</i> ;	72 <i>q</i>	נִמְבֹּהַ 75 <i>y</i>
th an imperative 110 <i>d</i>	נִטְיָהם 93 <i>ss</i>	נִמּוֹג 72 <i>v</i>
נָאֲדָר 23 <i>b</i>	נִלְדָּה 69 <i>t</i>	נִמּוֹל 72 <i>ee</i>
נָאֲדָרִי ? 90 <i>l</i>	נִוַּע (inf. constr.)	נִמְלָחַם 67 <i>dd</i>
נָאֲדָה 75 <i>x</i>	72 <i>q</i>	נִמְצָאִים 93 <i>oo</i>
נָאוּ 73 <i>g</i> , 75 <i>x</i>	נָה forms of 76 <i>c</i>	נִמַּר 72 <i>dd</i>
נָאוֹת 72 <i>h</i>	נִלְוֹ 67 <i>dd</i>	נִסְבָּה 67 <i>dd</i>
נָאֲחֻז 68 <i>i</i>	נִחְבָּאִים 93 <i>oo</i>	נִסָּה 76 <i>b</i>
נָאֻם 50 <i>a</i> ¹	נִחְבָּאת 63 <i>c</i>	נִסּוֹג 72 <i>r</i> , <i>v</i>
נָאֻף 64 <i>e</i>	נִחְבָּה 75 <i>pp</i>	נִסּוֹג אַחֲרֹר 29 <i>e</i>
נָאֻץ 52 <i>o</i> , 64 <i>e</i>	נָחַה forms of 78 <i>c</i>	נִסְפָּהֶם 91 <i>k</i>
נָאֲחֻזִּיד 84 ^b <i>e</i>	נָחַה 66 <i>c</i>	נִעְבְּדָם 60 <i>b</i>
נָאֻר 64 <i>e</i>	נָחַה 91 <i>e</i>	נִעֹר 72 <i>ee</i> , <i>v</i>
נָאֻרִים 67 <i>u</i>	נָחַל 67 <i>u</i>	נִעְתּוֹר 63 <i>c</i>
נָאֻרְתָּה 64 <i>e</i>	נָחַלָה (from חָלָה)	נִעְתּוֹת 63 <i>c</i>
נָבָאִים 93 <i>oo</i>	63 <i>c</i>	נִפְלָאת 74 <i>g</i>
נָבִיָּה 67 <i>dd</i>	נָחַלָה 90 <i>f</i>	נִפְלָאֲתָא 75 <i>oo</i>
נָבִיָּת 75 <i>qq</i>	נָחַלָה ? 80 <i>g</i>	נִפְלוֹ 61 <i>b</i>
נָבִלָה 67 <i>dd</i>	נָחַם 66 <i>f</i>	נִפְלָל 55 <i>d</i>
נָבִלָלוֹ 51 <i>h</i>	נָחִים 67 <i>u</i> , <i>dd</i>	נִפְץ 67 <i>dd</i> , 78 <i>b</i>
נָבִיָּה 93 <i>i</i>	נָחִנוֹ 32 <i>d</i>	נִפְצָה 67 <i>dd</i>
נָבִחוֹת 93 <i>r</i>	נָחִנָּה 23 <i>f</i> ¹	נִפְשׁ שְׁנִים 132 <i>g</i> , 134 <i>e</i> ¹
נָבִינֹתִי 86 <i>i</i>	נָחַר 67 <i>u</i>	נִצַּב forms of 78 <i>b</i>
נָבִינָת 80 <i>f</i>	נָחַרִי 75 <i>x</i>	נִצָּה 91 <i>e</i>
נָבִלֹת 75 <i>x</i>	נָחַת 95 <i>k</i>	נִצָּנִים 85 <i>u</i> ¹
נָבִפוֹ 61 <i>a</i>	נָחַת 67 <i>u</i>	נִצָּרָה 48 <i>i</i>
נָבִשׁ forms of 78 <i>c</i>	נָחִתוֹם 63 <i>c</i>	נִקְבָּצוֹ (imper.) 51 <i>o</i>
נָבִד ? 72 <i>n</i>	נָחַה forms of 76 <i>c</i>	נִקּוֹם 72 <i>h</i>
נָבִדָּה 67 <i>cc</i>	נָחַה 66 <i>c</i>	נִקְטָה 72 <i>dd</i>
נָבִדָּחֹ 92 <i>b</i> ¹	נָחוּת 75 <i>v</i>	נִקְטָו 72 <i>dd</i>
נָבִדָּחִי 20 <i>m</i>	נָחִיו 75 <i>x</i>	נִקְיָא 23 <i>i</i>
נָבִדָּחִי 92 <i>b</i> ¹	נָחִיָּם 93 <i>oo</i>	נִקְיָת 75 <i>x</i>
נָבִחַ 66 <i>c</i>	נָחַע 65 <i>d</i>	נִקְרָא 75 <i>rr</i>
	נָחַם 76 <i>f</i>	

נָרָא (Is 41²³ Keth.)
 48 *g*¹
 נָרַד 26 *r*
 נִרְפָּא 75 *oo*
 נִרְפָּתָה 75 *qq*
 נִשָּׂא 66 *c*, 76 *b*
 נִשָּׂא forms of 76 *b*
 נִשְׂאָת 76 *b*
 נִשְׂאָת 74 *i*, 94 *f*
 נִשְׂוָא 23 *i*, 75 *oo*
 נִשְׂוִי 75 *qq*
 נִשְׁקָה 66 *e*
 נִשְׂקָא 75 *oo*
 נִשְׂאָר 48 *g*¹
 נִשְׂדַּנּוּ 67 *u*
 נִשְׂנִי 52 *m*
 נִשְׂתָּה ? 75 *x*
 נִשְׂתָּעָה 75 *l*
 נַח forms of 78 *c*
 נָתַן 66 *h*, *i*; with
 accus. and infin. = *allow to*
 157 *b*²
 נָתַן 66 *i*, 69 *m*²
 נָתַן 66 *h*
 נָתַנוּ 44 *o*
 נָתַתָּ 19 *c*, 20 *l*
 נָתַתָּה 44 *g*, 66 *h*
 נִסְאָה ? 55 *f*
 סָבוּת 67 *d*¹
 סָבִיב 103 *o*
 סָבִיב 50 *e*
 סָבְלוּ 10 *h*, 93 *q*
 סֹג 72 *p*
 סֹפָתָה 90 *f*
 סֹרָה 72 *p*
 סֹתָה 91 *e*
 סִינִי 24 *g*¹
 סָכָה 91 *e*
 סָכַר 6 *k*
 סָלַם 85 *t*, 87 *h*

סָפִי 69 *h*¹
 סָפֹת (from יָסַף ?)
 69 *h*¹
 סָפִירִים *a letter* 124 *b*¹
 סָרִים 84 *b* *f*
 סָרַר 67 *cc*
 סָחֲמוֹם 60 *h*
 ע pronunciation
 6 *e*; with dageš *f*. implici-
 tum 22 *a-c*
 עָבְרִי 2 *b*, 9 *b*
 עָנַב 84 *a* *t*
 עָנֹל 93 *kk*
 עָרֵהֶם 32 *n*
 עַד, poetic עָרִי 103 *o*; with
 imperf. of past time 107 *c*
 עָדוּתִי ? 91 *n*
 עָרִיִּים 29 *e*¹
 עָרִיכֶם 103 *o*
 עָדַר 72 *m*
 עָוָה 67 *ff*
 עָוִן 55 *c*
 עָוֹל 93 *u*
 עָוֹנָה 61 *h*, 91 *d*
 עָוֹנִי 91 *k*
 עָוִרִי 72 *s*
 עֹאזֵל 30 *n*
 עֹבֹדֵיךָ 93 *uu*
 עֹרֹת 80 *g*
 עֹסִיָה 75 *v*
 עִי 24 *b*, 93 *y*
 עִין 82
 עִינוֹת 93 *v*
 עִיר 96
 עִירָה 91 *e*
 עִירוֹ 93 *v*
 עִירָם 27 *w*
 עַל 2 *f*¹
 עַל its origin
 101 *a*; poetic עָלִי 103 *o*;

uses of 119 *aa-dd*; caus
 with perfect 158 *b*, wi
 infin. 158 *c*; concessi
 160 *c*
 עָלִיךָ 133 *g*¹
 עָלִיָּה Is 23⁷ with
 article 126 *z*²
 עָלִימִי 103 *f*³
 עַם its origin
 101 *a*; pointing, with su
 103 *c*
 עָמַדךָ 61 *d*
 עָמוּקָה ? 93 *kk*
 עָמִי plur. apoc
 87 *f*
 עָמְמִים 93 *aa*
 עָנְבִי 20 *h*
 עָנִי 63 *l*
 עָנִי 63 *l*
 עָנוֹת 75 *aa*
 עָפְאִים 93 *z*
 עָץ 9 *l*, 26 *o*¹
 עָצְבוֹן 93 *uu*
 עָצְבִי 61 *a*
 עָקַב 93 *hh*
 עָקַרְב 19 *m*
 עָרְבִיאִים 93 *x*
 עָרְבִים 88 *c*
 עָרוֹ 75 *cc*
 עָרוֹם 118 *n*, 146
 עָרוּמִים 93 *pp*
 עָרוֹת (Hb 3¹³) 75
 עָרְכָה 48 *i*
 עָרְכִי 48 *i*
 עָרְלָה 95 *d*
 עָרְמָם 91 *e*
 עָשָׁבוֹת 20 *h*, 93 *o*
 עָשָׂה 69 *m*²
 עָשָׂהָאֵל 23 *k*¹
 עָשָׂהוּ 75 *n*

עָשׂוּ ptep. passive	פָּרָאוֹת 75 rr	קָאָם for קָם 9b, 23g,
24 b, 75 v	פָּרָם 1 i	analogous cases 72 p
עֲשׂוּת 75 v	פָּרִי 93 x	קָאָת 80 g
עֲשָׂה 80 l	פָּרִי 9 f	קָבָה-לִי 9 v, 67 o
עֲשָׂה 97 g	פָּרִיץ 84 ^b f	קָבָנוּ the 3 not com-
עֲשָׂרִים 93 l, 97 f	פָּרֶשׁ 84 ^b b	pensatory 20 o, for קָבָנוּ
עֲשָׂן 93 dd	פָּרָשׁוֹ 56	67 o, doubtful form 100 o ²
עֲשָׂה 67 cc	פָּרָשִׁים 93 dd	קָבָצָה 52 l
עֲשָׂשׁוּ 67 cc	פָּרַת 80 g	קָרְנִית 85 u
עֲשִׂיתִי 97 e ¹	פָּתָאִים 93 x	קָדָשִׁים 9 v, 93 r
עֲשִׂתָּרַת 95 q ¹		קָדָשִׁים 124 h
עֲתָה 90 h	צָאן with 3rd fem.	קָהֵלָת 145 h
עֲתִיק 84 ^b f	pl. 132 g, 145 c	קֹל = hark !
עַת נִשְׁפָּר ? 116 g ¹	צָאֲנִינִי ? 123 a ¹	146 b
	צָאָת 69 m	קָוִלִי constr. st. 90 n
פָּאָרָה 23 c	צָאָת 95 e	קָוָה 72 s
פָּדָה-צוֹר 23 k ¹	צָבָאוֹת 125 h	קָוָמוּ צָאוּ 20 g
פָּדִיּוֹם 85 t	צָבָאִים 93 x	קָוָמִים 72 p
פָּה 96	צָבִיהַ 75 qg	קֹוֶף 1 i
פָּיֶנֶת 80 f	צָדָק מֶן 133 b ²	קֹוֶתָהוּ 21 c
פָּחֶם (Ne 5 ¹⁴) ? 91 e	צָדִיקָתָהּ 52 p	לָקַח ? for לָקַח 19 i,
פָּיוֹת 96	צָהָרִים 88 c	66 g
פָּיִמוֹ 91 f	צוֹר (verb) 67 n	לָקַח ? for לָקַח 19 i,
פָּלָא 93 k	צוֹרִי 72 s	66 g
פָּלָא 22 e	צוֹרִיִּים 86 g	קָחֶם-נָא 58 g, 61 g,
פָּלַג 52 n	צָחָה 84 ^b c	66 g
פֶּן with imperf.	צָחִים, צִי 93 y	קָחַת 66 g, 93 h
vice perf.) 107 q and	צָלָה 67 cc	קָחַבְדִּי 93 q
ce ³ , 152 w (end), after	צָלָלִי 10 g	קָחַלִּי 26 g
as of fearing 152 w	צָלָמוֹת 30 r, 81 d ²	קָחַלָתָהּ 19 f
פָּנָה 91 e	צָלַע 93 gg	קָחַנִי ? 93 q
פָּנוּאֵל 90 k	צָלַע 93 gg	קָחַר 52 o
פָּנִים 145 h	צָמַח-תִּנְיָ 55 d	קָיָא 76 h
פָּנִימוֹ 103 f ³	צָעָקִי 46 d	קָיָ 76 h
פָּעַל 39 e, 41 d	צָפּוּ passive ptep.	קִימֹור 84 ^a u
פָּעֵלוֹ 93 q	75 v	קִים 72 m
פָּפִיּוֹת 96	צָפָדַע 81 d ² , 85 w	קִימָנוּ 91 f
פָּפָקוֹת 84 ^b n	צָקִין ? 44 l, 72 o	קָלוֹ 67 ee
פָּרָא 22 e		קָם 72 g

קַמְשָׁנִים 85 *u*¹
 קָמַת 44 *h*¹
 קָנַד 20 *g*
 קָנְמוֹן 93 *uu*
 קִסְמִי 46 *d*
 קָפוּד 27 *w*
 קִץ (Is 18⁶) 73 *b*
 קִצָּה 91 *e*
 קִצּוֹי 93 *x*
 קִצְרָכֶם 61 *d*
 קִרְאִים 75 *oo*
 קִרְאֹן 46 *f*
 קִרְאֹן 74 *h*
 קִרְאָת 74 *g*
 קִרְב 52 *n*, 64 *h*
 קִרְב 84 *n*
 קִרְבָּה 48 *i*
 קִרְחָא 80 *h*
 קִרְן 82
 קִרְנִים 88 *b*, 93 *n*
 קִשְׁט 26 *r*, 93 *p*

 ר 6 *g*, *o*
 ר 22 *q*, *s*
 רָאָה 105 *b*
 רָאוּ (א with Map-
 piq) 14 *d*, 64 *e*
 רִאיוֹה 75 *n*
 רִאיוֹת 75 *v*
 רִאיוֹה? 72 *p*
 רִאיוֹי 61 *h*, 75 *v*
 רָאשׁ 23 *g*, 72 *p*
 ראש 96
 ראשון 27 *w*
 רָבָה adverbial?
 132 *h*²
 רָבָה 48 *l*, 75 *cc*
 רָבּוּ 67 *ee*
 רָבּוּ 67 *m*
 רְבוּא 23 *i*

רְבָעִים 93 *qq*
 רִבְתָּ 73 *a*
 רִבְתִּי עִם 90 *l*
 רִנֵּעַ 65 *d*
 רִנְעִי 93 *ii*
 רִד 19 *i*, 69 *g*
 רִדָּה 69 *m*²
 רִדְפִי 61 *c*
 רוֹם 72 *q*
 רָחֶם 22 *h*
 רָחֻמָּה 80 *k*
 רָחֻמִּים 93 *l*, 145 *h*
 רִי 24 *b*, cf. 93 *y*
 רִיבּוֹת 73 *a*
 רִיב יָרִיב 73 *d*
 רִים 23 *e*
 רִבּוֹ 67 *ee*
 רִכְסִי 93 *r*
 רָמוֹ 67 *m*
 רָמוֹ 20 *i*
 רָפוּנִי? 87 *f*
 רָפִי 67 *ff*
 רָעֲבוֹן 85 *u*
 רָעָה 64 *d*
 רָעָה 84^a *i*, 93 *ll*
 רָעָה 67 *α*, *s*
 רָעוּהוּ 91 *k*
 רָעֲתֶכֶם 91 *k*
 רָפָאָה 74 *h*
 רָפְאִיתִי 75 *oo*
 רָפָה 75 *rrp*
 רָצוּא 113 *s*²
 רָק 153
 רָשָׁה (Moab.) 7 *c*

 ש pronunciation
 6 *i*, *k*
 שָׁאָת 76 *b*, 93 *t*
 שָׁרָה, שָׂרִי 84^a *f*, 93 *ll*

שָׂרִיד 93 *ss*
 שָׂה 96
 שָׁהָרוֹן 86 *g*
 שָׁמָה 73 *f*
 שָׁחוּ 24 *d*, 93 *x*
 שָׁטָן without art
 cle 125 *f*, 126 *e*¹
 שָׁכֻלֹת 6 *k*
 שָׁלַק 66 *e*
 שָׁמָל 23 *c*
 שָׁעִיר 82
 שָׁעַר 93 *gg*
 שָׁעֲרָה 82
 שָׂרִי (n. pr.) 80
 in Ju 5¹⁵, 87 *g*

 ש as preform-
 tive of noun 85 *o*
 שָׁ-, שָׁ-, שָׁ-, שָׁ- (relativ-
 36; uses of p. 485 note
 שָׁאָטִים 72 *p*
 שָׁאָטָד 23 *c*
 שָׁאָל 64 *e*
 שָׁאָלָה (Is 7¹¹) 29 *v*
 שָׁאָלוּנִי 64 *f*
 שָׁאָלָד 64 *f*
 שָׁאָלָתִיהוּ 64 *f*
 שָׁאָלָתִיו 44 *d*
 שָׁאָלָתִים 44 *d*, 64 *f*
 שָׁאָסוּד 67 *s*
 שָׁבִיסִים 86 *g*¹
 שָׁבִיתָד? 91 *e*
 שָׁבִעָנָה? 97 *c*
 שָׁבְרִי 61 *b*
 שָׁבַת 69 *c*
 שָׂרִיד 20 *b*, 67 *cc*
 שָׂא form of
 name 10
 שָׁב infin. abs.,

or for יָשׁוּב 19 *i*, 69 *g*; in-
n. constr. (once) of יָשׁוּב 72 *q*
יָשׁוּבִי (imper.) 72 *s*
יָשׁוּבִי 72 *b*
יָשׁוּבִי 75 *z*
יָשׁוּבִי 22 *p*, 64 *a*
יָשׁוּבִי 67 *ee*
יָשׁוּבִי 67 *cc*
יָשׁוּבִי 64 *a*
יָשׁוּבִי 95 *k*
יָשׁוּבִי 85 *v*
יָשׁוּבִי 93 *v*
יָשׁוּבִי 45 *c*
יָשׁוּבִי 61 *c*, 93 *s*
יָשׁוּבִי 65 *g*
יָשׁוּבִי 44 *c*
יָשׁוּבִי 90 *n*
יָשׁוּבִי 55 *i*, 85 *o*
יָשׁוּבִי 21 *c*
יָשׁוּבִי with accus.
121 *d*¹
יָשׁוּבִי subst. and
adj. 141 *c*²
יָשׁוּבִי 65 *a*
יָשׁוּבִי 52 *o*
יָשׁוּבִי 61 *h*, 65 *d*
יָשׁוּבִי 21 *f*, 28 *e*²
יָשׁוּבִי 129 *h*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 84^a *g*
יָשׁוּבִי 52 *o*
יָשׁוּבִי 93 *qq*
יָשׁוּבִי 129 *h*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 23 *f*
יָשׁוּבִי 26 *o*¹, 96
יָשׁוּבִי 90 *k*
יָשׁוּבִי (inf.) 67 *r*
יָשׁוּבִי 88 *d*, 96
יָשׁוּבִי see Additions

יָשׁוּבִי 97 *e*
יָשׁוּבִי 46 *f*
יָשׁוּבִי 80 *g*
יָשׁוּבִי 48 *i*², 61 *f*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 88 *c*
יָשׁוּבִי 48 *i*², 61 *f*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 23 *l*
יָשׁוּבִי 75 *rr*
יָשׁוּבִי (Phoen.) 7 *d*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 95 *c*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 97 *d*
יָשׁוּבִי 80 *g*
יָשׁוּבִי 65 *d*
יָשׁוּבִי 135 *p*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 29 *i*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 86 *g*
יָשׁוּבִי 10 *g*
יָשׁוּבִי 80 *f*
יָשׁוּבִי 84^b *m*
יָשׁוּבִי 93 *o*
יָשׁוּבִי 95 *f*
יָשׁוּבִי 22 *s*
יָשׁוּבִי 23 *f*
יָשׁוּבִי 22 *s*
יָשׁוּבִי 9 *v*, 93 *r*
יָשׁוּבִי 55 *f*
יָשׁוּבִי 9 *u*, 26 *o*¹
יָשׁוּבִי (only Qal) 78 *b*
יָשׁוּבִי 73 *d*
יָשׁוּבִי 67 *ee*
יָשׁוּבִי (inf. abs.) 75 *n*
יָשׁוּבִי 73 *d*
יָשׁוּבִי 97 *b*¹
יָשׁוּבִי 97 *d*

ת as preforma-
tive of nouns 85 *p-r*
ת, ת- original femi-
nine ending 80 *f, g*, 89 *e*
ת 63 *m*, 93 *t*¹

תָּאחַר 65 *e*
תָּאחַל 68 *c*
תָּאחַלָּהּ 68 *f*
תָּאחַלָּהּ 51 *m*
תָּאחַלָּהּ 68 *h*
תָּאחַר 93 *g*
תָּאחַר 68 *f*
תָּאחַר 75 *hh*
תָּאחַר 72 *k*
תָּאחַר 48 *d*
תָּאחַר 48 *d*
תָּאחַר 10 *g*³
תָּאחַר as 3rd pl. fem.
47 *k*
תָּאחַל 85 *p*
תָּאחַל 75 *hh*
תָּאחַל 53 *n*
תָּאחַל 75 *hh*
תָּאחַל 27 *l*
תָּאחַל 52 *n*
תָּאחַל 75 *oo*
תָּאחַל 67 *t*
תָּאחַל 75 *dd*
תָּאחַל 53 *n*
תָּאחַל 85 *r*
תָּאחַל 75 *hh*
תָּאחַל 72 *k*
תָּאחַל 53 *n*
תָּאחַל 69 *x*
תָּאחַל 80 *g*
תָּאחַל 53 *q*
תָּאחַל 75 *gg*
תָּאחַל 84^a *r*
תָּאחַל 50 *e*
תָּאחַל 23 *f*
תָּאחַל 26 *r*, 69 *v*
תָּאחַל 51 *g*
תָּאחַל 47 *k*
תָּאחַל 72 *r*

תַּחְנוּתִי 91 *n*
 תַּחַת 103 *o*
 תַּחַת 66 *f*
 תַּחְתָּנָה 103 *d*
 תַּחְתָּנִי 103 *d*
 תַּטְעִי (Is17¹⁰)? 20 *m*³
 תִּיטְבִי 70 *e*
 תִּיכּוֹן 27 *w*
 תִּיעֲשֶׂה 63 *h*
 תִּירְאוּ (Jb 6²¹+) 75 *t*
 תִּישְׁמְנָה (Ez6⁶)? 67 *p*², *dd*
 תִּכְבֶּדְךָ 60 *f*
 תִּכּוֹן 19 *d*
 תִּכְיִים 1 *i*
 תִּכְלָה 77 *rr*
 תִּל־ 20 *g*
 תִּלְאוּם 75 *rr*
 תִּלְאִים 75 *rr*
 תִּלְבָּשֶׁן 47 *l*
 תִּלְוֹנִי 72 *ee*
 תִּלּוֹן 29 *q*, 73 *e*
 תִּלְעַן 10 *g*³
 תִּמּוּתָנָה 72 *k*
 תִּלְ-תַּמְחִי? 75 *ii*
 תִּמְחִץ 10 *g*³
 תִּמְנִי 67 *e*, *dd*
 תִּמְנִי (Lam3²²)? 200
 תִּמָּם 85 *p*

תִּמְקָנָה 67 *dd*
 תִּלְ-תַּמְרִי 67 *y*
 תִּנְדֹּף? 66 *f*
 תִּנְשֵׂא 19 *d*
 תִּתְנַחַח אֶת־ 121 *b*¹
 תִּסְבִּינָה 67 *d*¹
 תִּעְבְּרִם 60 *b*
 תִּעְבִּירִי 47 *g*
 תִּעֲנֶנָּה 51 *m*
 תִּעֲנֶנָּה 58 *k*
 תִּעֲלֹ? 75 *y*
 תִּעֲנֶנָּה (Ju 5²⁹) 75 *w*
 תִּעֲפֶה 48 *d*
 תִּעֲשֶׂה 75 *hh*
 תִּעֲשֶׂרְנָה 60 *g*
 תִּפְּצוּתֵיכֶם? 91 *l*
 תִּצְלִינָה 67 *p*
 תִּצְלֹנָה 67 *g*
 תִּצְרִי 67 *dd*
 תִּקְבְּנוּ 67 *g*
 תִּקְוִי-מִיָּד 72 *cc*
 תִּקְטֹל 47 *k*
 תִּקְיִמְנָה? 72 *k*
 תִּקְרָאנָה 47 *k*, 75 *rr*
 תִּרְאֵא 75 *p*
 תִּרְאֶה 75 *hh*
 תִּרְאִינָה 75 *w*

תִּרְרֵ 69 *p*
 תִּרְדָּמָה 85 *q*
 תִּרְוָם (Jb 17⁴) 72 *cc*
 תִּרְנָה 47 *k*
 תִּרְנָה 44 *o*
 תִּרְפִּים 124 *h*, 132 *h*²
 תִּרְפִּינָה 75 *qq*
 תִּרְצָחוּ? 52 *q*
 תִּשְׁאִינָה (Ez 23⁴⁹)? 76
 תִּשְׁנָה (Ru 1¹⁴) 74 *k*
 76 *b*
 תִּשְׁכֹּן 72 *k*
 תִּשְׁכְּנָה 72 *k*
 תִּשִּׁי? 75 *s*
 תִּשְׁלַחְנָה (anomalously) 47 *k*
 תִּשְׁמֹרֶם 47 *g*
 תִּשְׁתַּע 75 *bb*
 תִּתְאוּ 75 *bb*
 תִּתְאוּ? 75 *bb*¹
 תִּתְבַּר 67 *l*
 תִּתְנַר 75 *bb*
 תִּתְהֶ 19 *i*, 66 *k*
 תִּתָּם 67 *y*
 תִּתָּם 67 *p*
 תִּתְעֹצוּ 20 *m*
 תִּתְשִׁ 53 *u*

III

INDEX OF PASSAGES

The references are to the sections and their marginal letters, except where otherwise indicated. N. = note.

Genesis

- 1 1 . 5 *n*, 21 *b*, 117 *a*,
125 *f*, 142 *g*, 145 *h*
2 . . 141 *c* N., 142 *c*
3 . . 109 *b*, 145 *h*
4 . . 53 *n*, 117 *h*
5 . 29 *e*, 98 *a*, 111 *c*
6 . . 102 *h*, 116 *r*
7 . 16 *b*, 21 *b*, 138 *b*
8 . . . 126 *w*
9 75 *t*, 107 *n*, 109 *a* N.
11 . 16 *h*, 20 *f*, 117 *r*
12 . . . 20 *f*, 91 *d*
14 112 *q*, 145 *o*, 145 *s*
16 133 *f*
20 . . . 15 *m*, 117 *z*
21 . 91 *c*, 91 *k*, 117 *c*,
126 *x*
22 64 *g*
24 90 *o*
26 75 *l*, 119 *h*, 122 *s*,
124 *g* N.
27 . . 117 *kk*, 122 *g*
28 110 *c*
29 16 *a*, 106 *m*, 141 *n*
31 . . 126 *w*, 131 *q*
2 1 111 *k*
2 . . 106 *f*, 138 *a*
3 . . 114 *o*, 126 *w*
4 . 5 *n*, 20 *f*, 114 *q*
5 106 *f*, 107 *c*, 142 *a*,
152 *k*, 152 *r*
6 107 *b*, 107 *d*, 112 *e*,
142 *b*
7 . . 70 *a*, 117 *hh*
9 . . 115 *d*, 127 *b*
10 107 *d*, 112 *e*, 141 *a*
11 98 *a*, 117 *g*, 126 *k*,
134 *k*, 141 *n*
12 . . . 10 *g*, 141 *b*
13 26 *o* N.
14 118 *g*
15 122 *l*
16 . . 26 *o* N., 113 *p*
17 61 *d*, 113 *n*, 114 *b*,
135 *c* N., 143 *c*
18 . . . 75 *l*, 114 *a*
19 70 *a*, 107 *k*, 131 *n*
N., 145 *m*

Genesis

- 2 21 103 *d*
23 10 *h*, 20 *c*, 52 *d*,
102 *g*, 125 *i*, 126 *b*,
141 *a*
24 . . 107 *g*, 112 *m*
25 9 *o*, 72 *m*, 85 *t*,
93 *pp*, 107 *b*, 111 *d*,
134 *d*
3 1 111 *a*, 119 *w*, 142 *c*,
152 *b*
2 107 *s*
3 72 *u*
4 . . . 72 *u*, 113 *v*
5 61 *d*, 112 *oo*, 116 *n*
6 . 35 *g*, 116 *e*, 131 *t*
7 . . . 85 *t*, 93 *pp*
8 . . 118 *p*, 146 *f*
10 142 *f*
11 . . 114 *s*, 150 *e*
12 . 44 *g*, 68 *e*, 135 *c*
13 136 *c*, 142 *a*, 148 *b*
14 116 *r* N., 118 *k*,
119 *w*
15 117 *ll*
16 154 *a* N.
17 10 *g*
19 . 29 *e*, 95 *e*, 141 *l*
21 . . . 60 *g*, 128 *o*
22 76 *i*, 96 (77N),
107 *q*, 112 *p*, 114 *o*,
124 *g* N., 130 *a*,
152 *w*
24 128 *h*
4 2 . . 131 *h*, 142 *d*
4 91 *c*, 106 *d*, 154 *a*
N.
6 . . . 20 *f*, 144 *b*
7 145 *u*
9 . . 106 *g*, 150 *d*
10 . . 146 *b*, 148 *b*
12 109 *d*, 114 *m*, 164 *d*
13 76 *b*, 133 *c*, 141 *m*
14 . . 112 *p*, 116 *g*
15 97 *h*, 114 *s*, 115 *k*
116 *w*, 117 *e*, 134 *r*
16 118 *g*
17 29 *e*
18 121 *b*

Genesis

- 4 20 117 *bb*
22 127 *b*
23 44 *o*, 46 *f*
24 29 *g*, 134 *r*, 159 *bb*,
159 *dd*
25 9 *u*, 16 *f*, 26 *o* N.,
157 *b*
26 107 *c*, 135 *h*, 144 *k*
5 1 115 *i*, 119 *h*, 125 *f*
3 134 *d*
5 146 *c*
20 134 *h*
23 . . 145 *g*, 146 *c*
24 152 *m*
6 1 164 *d*
2 117 *h*, 119 *w* N.,
128 *v*
3 67 *p*, 72 *r*
4 107 *e*, 112 *e*, 128 *t*
5 157 *b*
8 142 *b*
9 16 *b*
11 117 *z*
13 117 *z*
14 112 *r*, 117 *ii*, 126 *m*
17 112 *t*, 116 *p*, 131 *k*
N., 158 *a*
18 . . . 49 *l*, 72 *w*
19 35 *f*
21 107 *g*
22 117 *b*
7 1 . . 117 *e*, 117 *h*
2 138 *b*
4 112 *t*, 116 *p*, 118 *k*,
141 *a*, 141 *f*
5 117 *b*
6 164 *a*
7 146 *f*
9 134 *q*
11 126 *y*, 129 *f*, 134 *o*
13 . 97 *c*, 104 *g*, 139 *g*
15 127 *c*
19 . . 106 *d*, 133 *k*
20 118 *h*
21 119 *i*
22 . . . 119 *w* N.
23 . . . 51 *n*, 75 *o*
8 3 . . . 63 *f*, 113 *u*

Genesis

- 8 4 124 o
 5 129 f, 134 p
 7 70 a N., 113 s,
 126 r, 126 t
 8 150 i
 9 135 i
 12 69 t
 13 15 l, 72 t, 72 aa
 14 129 f
 17 69 v, 70 b, 119 i
 18 15 g, 146 f
 21 72 aa
 22 104 g, 146 d
 2 135 m
 3 117 c, 138 b
 4 119 n, 131 k
 5 139 c
 6 116 w, 121 f, 143 b
 9 143 a
 10 116 h, 119 i, 143 e
 11 121 f, 152 b
 14 52 d, 112 y, 117 r
 15 159 g
 16 131 t
 19 67 dd, 134 k
 20 120 b
 21 75 bb, 91 e
 22 117 f
 23 117 f, 141 e, 146 f
 24 70 a, 133 g
 25 133 i
 26 116 r N.
 27 75 gg
 10 5 139 b
 9 107 g
 11 118 f
 17 35 g
 19 91 d, 144 h
 21 135 h
 26 35 m
 11 1 141 d
 3 69 o, 117 r
 4 107 q, 152 w
 5 114 g
 6 67 w, 67 dd, 133 d,
 147 b
 7 67 dd, 107 q, 124 g
 N., 165 b
 8 63 f
 9 144 d
 10 118 i
 28 125 h
 29 146 f
 30 152 o
 31 20 f
 12 1 119 s, 121 c
 2 63 q, 110 i, 141 d
 3 116 g
 4 134 h
 7 116 o

Genesis

- 12 8 91 e, 156 c
 9 113 u
 11 111 g, 114 m
 12 112 c, 112 y, 112 hh,
 164 d
 13 110 d, 112 p, 141 l,
 157 a, 165 b
 14 111 g, 117 h, 118 u
 15 118 f
 16 145 o
 17 117 q
 19 111 m, 117 f, 147 b
 13 2 126 m
 3 138 c, 154 a N.
 5 145 o
 8 131 b
 9 51 n, 56, 159 dd
 10 144 h
 11 139 e
 12 142 c
 13 140 a
 14 104 g
 15 142 g, 143 c
 16 166 b
 17 120 g
 14 4 118 i, 134 o
 5 134 o
 6 93 aa, 131 f
 9 134 k
 10 27 q, 90 c, 90 i,
 93 aa, 123 e, 130 e
 13 2 b, 126 r, 128 u
 17 115 a
 18 129 c
 19 121 f, 128 a
 22 106 i
 23 102 b, 109 g, 135 a,
 149 c, 154 a N.
 24 135 c
 15 1 126 r, 131 q
 2 116 n, 118 n, 128 v,
 141 e
 5 150 i
 6 112 ss, 122 q, 135 p
 7 29 f, 66 i, 138 d
 10 139 b, 139 c
 11 126 r
 12 114 i
 13 113 o, 135 p, 155 e
 14 119 n
 15 135 a
 16 118 g
 17 111 g
 18 106 m, 136 b
 18 1 142 b, 156 b
 2 51 g, 51 p, 119 x
 3 102 f
 4 67 p
 5 5 n, 103 o, 135 a,
 135 m

Genesis

- 16 7 60 d, 127 e
 8 10 k, 76 g, 107 h,
 116 n
 10 166 a
 11 80 d, 94 f, 116 n
 12 127 c, 128 l, 156 b
 16 115 f
 17 1 110 f
 4 143 a
 5 117 ii, 121 b, 163 a
 8 128 p
 9 142 f N.
 10 113 gg
 11 67 dd, 112 aa, 121 d,
 144 b
 14 29 g, 67 v, 112 mm,
 158 a, 167 b N.
 15 143 b
 17 96, 100 l, 107 t,
 134 d, 150 g
 19 49 l
 20 106 m, 112 s
 21 154 a
 26 72 ee
 18 1 116 o, 118 g, 141 e
 5 158 b N.
 6 90 c, 90 i, 131 d
 7 117 f, 126 r
 9 147 b
 10 118 u
 11 116 d, 146 d
 12 106 n, 139 f, 141 e,
 150 a, 150 b
 13 106 g, 136 c
 14 133 c, 139 d, 141 m
 15 106 b, 163 a
 17 100 l
 18 75 n, 142 d
 19 114 o, 165 c
 20 128 h, 148 d, 159 ee
 21 100 l, 108 b, 135 m,
 138 k
 24 117 g, 122 l
 25 112 v, 115 b, 161 c
 26 112 ff
 27 141 e
 28 47 m, 117 aa,
 119 p, 134 l, 159 n
 N., 159 r
 29 134 k
 19 1 116 o, 141 e, 141 f,
 156 c
 2 17 e, 20 d, 20 g,
 100 o, 135 q, 142 g,
 150 n, 152 c
 4 15 l, 107 c, 152 r,
 154 a N., 164 c
 5 29 f
 6 93 i
 8 34 b, 103 b, 139 d

Genesis

19 9 . . . 66 c, 113 r
 11 . . . 126 n
 12 . . . 150 b
 14 . . . 20 g, 116 d
 15 . . . 152 w
 16 15 f, 45 d, 55 g,
 115 f
 17 . . . 107 p
 18 . . . 152 g
 19 60 d, 72 n, 107 f,
 152 w, 154 a
 20 . . . 109 f
 21 . . . 61 a
 22 . . . 120 g
 23 . . . 164 b
 28 . . . 126 o
 29 . . 115 a, 124 o
 30 . . . 126 r
 31 . . 133 f, 152 o
 32 . . 69 x, 117 cc
 33 5 n, 47 l, 61 c, 93 s,
 126 y
 34 . . . 126 b
 20 1 . . . 90 c
 5 . . . 32 l
 6 66 b, 75 qq, 114 m,
 157 b N.
 7 . . . 63 q, 110 i
 9 . . . 107 w
 10 . . 107 v, 166 b
 11 . . 112 x, 153
 12 . . . 152 d
 13 119 u, 124 h N.,
 127 e, 141 f, 145 i,
 167 b
 16 . . 116 s, 134 n
 17 . . . 145 u
 18 . . 106 f, 113 n
 21 3 . . . 138 k
 5 . . 121 b, 128 v
 6 . 10 g, 64 h, 114 c
 7 106 p, 124 o, 142 f,
 151 a
 8 . . . 51 m
 9 . . . 52 n
 11 . . . 67 p
 13 . . . 143 c
 14 95 l, 128 q, 156 d
 N⁴
 16 75 kk, 108 b, 113 h,
 119 k, 119 s
 17 . . . 138 e
 19 . . . 117 cc
 20 . . . 131 b
 23 . . 20 f, 51 o
 24 . . 51 p, 135 a
 25 . . . 112 rr
 26 . . . 162 b
 28 . . 91 c, 127 e
 29 . . 91 f, 126 x

Genesis

21 30 . . 117 d, 157 b
 32 . . 138 f, 146 h
 22 1 . . . 111 g
 3 . . . 135 i
 4 . . . 111 b
 5 . . . 119 s
 7 . . . 147 b
 12 . . 116 g, 158 a
 14 . . 130 d N²
 17 . . . 75 ff
 23 . . . 134 k
 24 . . 111 h, 147 e
 23 1 . . 134 d, 134 h
 3 . . . 122 f
 4 . . 52 f, 128 m
 5 . . . 110 e
 6 75 qq, 119 x, 128 r,
 142 f N², 152 b
 8 . . . 61 g
 9 . . . 119 p
 10 116 h, 141 b, 143 e
 11 . . 106 m, 152 c
 13 . . . 110 e
 20 . . . 111 k
 24 3 . . 128 a, 165 b
 5 . . 100 n, 113 q
 6 . . 51 n, 152 w
 7 . . . 138 a
 8 . 75 x, 109 d, 126 y
 9 . . . 16 h
 14 112 bb, 135 p,
 167 c
 15 106 f, 107 c, 152 r
 18 . . . 120 d
 19 . . 106 o, 164 b
 20 . . . 75 bb
 21 . . 130 a, 150 i
 22 . . 134 n, 156 b
 23 . . 37 a, 118 g
 26 . . . 67 g
 27 . 75 u, 135 e, 143 b
 29 . . . 156 b
 30 . 115 e N., 116 s
 31 . . . 116 l
 33 . . . 73 f
 35 . . 154 a N.
 37 . . . 149 c
 41 95 n, 117 f, 164 d
 42 . . 159 v, 167 c
 43 . . . 112 t
 44 . 154 a N., 162 b
 45 . . . 135 a
 48 . . . 75 t
 49 . . . 159 v
 51 . . 109 f, 117 f
 55 . . 139 h, 146 f
 56 . . . 142 d
 58 . . . 150 n
 60 . 63 q, 97 g, 134 g
 61 . . 146 g, 146 h

Genesis

24 63 . . . 114 f N.
 65 . . . 34 f
 67 . . . 127 f
 25 1 . . . 120 d
 5 . . . 16 a
 16 . . . 136 d
 21 . . 51 n, 121 f
 23 . . . 119 ff
 24 . . . 23 f
 26 115 a, 115 c, 115 e
 N.
 31 . . . 35 n, 48 i
 34 . . . 75 o
 26 7 144 p N., 147 a N.
 9 148 b, 152 w, 157 b
 10 . . 49 l, 106 p
 13 . . 113 u, 164 f
 15 . . 60 h, 135 o
 16 . . . 133 c
 18 . 60 h, 111 g, 120 d
 23 . . . 118 f
 25 . . . 76 c
 28 . 75 n, 103 p N.
 29 . . 65 h, 75 hh
 27 1 111 g, 114 d, 119 y
 3 . . 118 f, 122 t
 4 . 20 b, 106 g, 108 d
 7 . . . 58 g
 9 . . . 117 ii
 12 . . 49 l, 112 p
 13 . . 10 g, 141 f
 19 . . . 60 d
 20 114 n N., 136 c,
 148 b
 21 . . 67 r, 136 d
 24 . . . 150 a
 26 . . . 10 g
 28 . . . 20 m
 29 . . . 145 l
 30 . 113 n, 164 b N.
 31 . . . 72 t
 33 107 c, 116 d, 117 q,
 150 l, 153
 34 111 h N., 113 m,
 117 q, 135 e
 36 63 m, 136 d, 150 e
 37 103 g, 117 ff, 117 ii,
 142 g, 150 l
 38 . 10 g, 16 g, 100 l
 39 . . 20 m, 119 c
 41 . . . 63 f
 42 . . 61 a, 121 a
 43 . . 112 r, 119 s
 45 114 d, 114 r,
 117 aa, 118 i,
 150 e, 154 a N.
 28 2 . . . 16 h, 90 i
 3 . . . 75 u
 4 . . 95 g, 114 g
 6 . . . 167 c

Genesis

- 28 8 III d
 9 II9 aa N.
 11 126 r
 15 106 o, 147 b
 16 106 g
 18 71
 29 2 III e, 144 f
 6 150 n
 7 126 i, 152 d
 9 116 u, 129 h
 10 . 67 p, 75 gg, 106 f
 14 131 d
 15 112 cc, 150 e
 17 145 n
 19 133 a
 21 69 o, 165 a
 25 142 g
 26 107 g
 27 121 b
 30 133 b
 32 60 d
 30 3 51 g
 6 26 g, 59 f
 8 85 n, 117 q, 154 a
 N.
 13 106 n
 15 114 a
 16 126 y
 18 17 c, 135 m
 19 96
 20 117 bb, 117 ff
 23 135 m
 27 111 h N., 120 f,
 159 dd
 29 157 c
 31 120 g, 120 h
 32 112 mm
 34 109 b, 151 e
 37 117 r, 123 b
 38 10 g, 47 k, 76 g,
 95 f, 138 c, 145 c
 39 69 f, 145 p
 40 . 119 aa N., 142 f
 41 91 f, 112 ee
 43 132 g
 31 2 138 f
 6 32 i
 7 67 w, 112 h
 8 145 u, 159 r, 159 s
 9 135 o
 13 127 f
 14 146 g, 146 h
 15 113 r
 19 67 cc
 23 118 h
 27 63 c, 111 m, 114 n
 N.
 28 75 n
 29 152 i
 30 51 i, 113 p

Genesis

- 31 32 59 g, 138 f
 34 111 q, 124 h N.,
 132 h N.
 35 106 l
 36 20 d, 37 d
 39 23 f, 74 k, 75 oo,
 75 gg, 90 l, 107 e
 40 67 cc, 76 a, 104 g,
 143 a N., 167 b N.
 41 136 d
 42 106 p
 44 69 x
 45 117 ii
 47 1 c
 52 149 c, 167 b
 53 145 i
 32 1 103 b, 122 g
 3 136 b
 5 64 h, 68 f
 6 . 49 e, 104 g, 123 b
 7 116 s
 8 67 p, 144 b
 9 112 p, 145 u
 10 116 o
 11 106 g, 119 n, 133 c
 12 119 aa N., 152 w,
 156 c
 13 107 w
 15 134 c
 16 28 b, 122 d, 132 e,
 135 o
 17 123 d
 18 9 v, 10 g, 60 b, 64 f,
 137 b
 19 124 i
 20 . 52 n, 61 d, 74 h
 25 51 n
 27 . 60 f, 65 h, 163 c
 30 20 f, 107 h
 31 90 k, 111 e, 156 c,
 157 b
 33 2 146 e N.
 3 66 b
 4 5 n
 5 37 a, 67 a, 117 ff,
 137 a
 7 146 h
 8 147 a N.
 10 . 112 gg, 158 b N.
 11 74 g
 13 60 h, 104 g, 122 d,
 126 i, 135 o
 18 118 n
 19 134 g
 34 5 112 ss
 7 45 c, 45 g
 8 140 d
 9 117 w
 15 72 h, 119 p
 16 44 o, 49 k

Genesis

- 34 19 64 d
 22 72 ee
 23 143 a
 24 145 d
 25 118 q, 131 q
 27 144 g
 30 128 n, 141 d
 31 107 t, 118 v
 35 1 65 a
 3 116 d
 7 . 124 h N., 145 i
 8 126 d, 144 d
 11 145 f
 13 142 g
 14 138 c
 22 15 p, 45 g
 26 121 b
 38 7 133 c
 37 2 126 z
 3 112 h, 133 b
 4 115 c
 7 47 l, 116 o
 8 113 q, 150 h
 15 107 f, 116 s
 16 142 f N.
 17 117 f
 18 117 w
 19 128 u
 21 117 ll
 23 117 cc
 29 152 l
 30 116 p, 143 a
 32 150 i
 33 60 d, 113 w
 35 118 n
 38 5 112 uu
 9 . 13 c, 66 i, 112 gg
 11 118 g, 152 w
 17 159 dd
 21 126 y
 24 20 m, 97 c, 116 s,
 119 y N.
 25 32 l, 74 i, 116 v,
 142 e
 26 133 b N.
 28 144 d
 29 164 g
 39 1 142 b
 4 130 d, 155 d, 155 n
 5 145 q
 6 128 x
 8 137 c
 9 107 t, 112 p
 10 123 c
 11 35 n, 126 s
 14 . 2 b, 29 g, 64 g
 16 72 ee
 18 114 r
 20 130 c
 22 116 s

Genesis

39 23 . . . 116 o, 152 l
40 4 139 h
5 129 h
7 84^b f, 87 t
8 152 o
9 143 d
10 91 e, 164 g
13 72 w
14 105 b N., 106 n N.,
163 d
15 2 b
16 135 f
20 69 w, 71, 121 b
22 144 n
41 1 116 s, 119 cc, 131 d
6 116 l
8 64 b, 122 i
11 49 e
12 139 c
15 152 o, 157 a
21 91 f, 93 ss
25 116 d
26 126 x, 141 h
28 53 p
29 156 c
30 112 x
33 75 p, 75 hh
39 115 a
40 118 h
42 117 cc
43 85 h, 113 z, 129 h
49 75 ff
51 52 m
57 145 e
42 1 54 f
2 109 g
4 75 rr
6 126 k
7 122 q
9 114 g
10 163 a
11 32 d, 91 f
13 133 g, 141 b, 152 m
16 110 c
18 110 f
19 134 d
23 126 r
25 93 m, 120 f, 124 l,
139 c
28 119 gg
30 124 i, 126 p
33 134 d
35 111 g, 116 u, 139 c
36 91 f, 135 p
37 159 r
43 3 113 n, 163 c
5 116 q, 159 v
6 150 i N.
7 107 k, 107 t, 113 q,
150 d

Genesis

43 9 159 o
10 106 p, 159 x
12 65 d, 72 bb, 93 pp,
131 e
14 29 u, 106 o
15 20 c, 131 q
16 65 b
17 90 c
18 116 d
21 49 e
26 14 d
27 141 c N.
28 67 g
29 67 n
33 119 gg
34 134 r, 144 n
44 1 47 m, 138 e
2 135 n N.
3 142 e, 144 c
4 138 e, 156 f, 164 b
5 119 m N.
9 112 ii, 138 f
10 153
12 156 d
16 20 d, 58 k
22 159 g
23 137 b
28 113 w
29 112 kk
31 112 oo
33 69 p, 109 b
34 152 w
45 4 138 d
7 117 n
8 119 hh
14 93 pp
23 102 g
46 2 124 e, 126 r
3 69 m
4 113 w
22 121 b
27 121 b, 132 g
30 108 b
34 127 e
47 3 145 r
6 120 e
9 128 a
11 69 v
17 93 ss
19 67 p
21 139 e N., 143 c
22 112 l
24 145 u
48 1 144 d
2 144 d N²
9 58 g, 60 d, 61 g
11 75 n, 115 b
14 141 e, 156 d
22 96, 106 m, 130 g
49 1 75 rr

Genesis

49 3 29 u
4 53 n, 124 b, 144 p,
147 c
8 135 e
10 20 h, 164 f
11 7c, 52 l, 90 m, 91 e,
93 v, 96, 106 k,
116 x, 118 p
12 93 dd
13 95 i
15 117 b N.
17 20 h, 109 k
18 106 g
21 126 b
22 44 m, 80 g, 96,
145 k
23 67 m, 112 rr
25 117 ff, 119 c
27 29 l, 29 u, 107 g,
155 f
30 138 b N.
50 13 138 b N.
15 117 ff, 159 y
18 58 k
20 75 n
23 128 v
25 116 v
26 73 f, 144 d N.

Exodus

1 1 49 b N.
7 117 z, 121 d, 133 k
10 47 k, 75 rr, 112 y
12 107 e
14 119 o
16 67 k, 72 w, 76 i
18 47 l
19 47 l, 112 oo
20 47 l
21 135 o
22 127 b N.
2 1 117 d
2 117 h
3 20 h, 58 g, 114 m,
126 m
4 69 m, 71
6 131 m
9 69 x, 70 e, 135 m
10 111 d
15 126 r
16 75 w
17 60 d, 60 h, 135 o
20 46 f, 154 b
3 2 52 s, 119 i, 126 r
3 108 b, 126 v
8 128 x
9 117 r
10 110 i
11 107 u

Exodus

3	13	112 t
	15	133 l
	18	49 l
	19	69 x, 157 b N.
	20	63 m
	21	164 d
	22	95 k, 139 b
4	1	107 i
	2	37 c
	4	29 g, 64 c
	10	61 e, 128 t, 152 d
	12	75 ee
	13	130 d, 155 n
	14	159 g
	21	112 mm, 143 d
5	2	107 u
	5	112 cc
	7	68 h
	10	152 m
	11	138 e
	16	74 g, 116 t, 152 o
	18	163 a
	19	57 N., 135 k
	20	126 r
	21	66 i, 102 f
	23	113 v
6	3	119 i, 144 l N.
	6	112 x
	10	20 c N.
	14	124 r
	28	52 o, 130 d
7	9	109 h, 159 d
	11	131 l
	20	119 q
	27	52 s
8	1	20 m, 75 gg
	4	63 o
	10	123 e
	17	117 z
	20	107 b
	22	150 a, 159 w
9	4	130 d, 155 n
	9	117 z
	15	106 p
	16	115 e N.
	18	91 e, 127 f
	23	63 n, 69 x
	27	126 k
	30	107 c
	31	141 d
10	1	126 y
	3	51 l, 106 h
	4	65 e
	6	161 b
	7	107 c, 152 r
	8	137 a
	9	91 k, 127 e
	10	154 a N.
	11	135 p
	22	133 i

Exodus

10	28	69 v
11	6	135 o
	8	9 v
12	4	133 c, 139 c
	5	128 v
	6	88 c
	8	154 a N.
	12	124 g
	13	159 g
	14	67 n
	15	20 g, 112 mm, 116 w, 126 w
	16	146 c, 152 b
	18	134 o
	21	46 d
	23	126 l N.
	27	61 a
	31	20 g
	34	107 c
	39	117 ii
	43	119 m
	48	113 gg
	49	145 u
13	2	52 n
	3	113 bb
	7	118 k, 121 b
	8	138 h
	18	67 y
	21	53 q
14	2	93 q
	11	61 c, 152 y
	20	139 e N.
15	1	20 e, 107 c, 146 f
	2	58 k, 80 g, 117 b
	4	128 r
	5	58 g, 75 dd, 91 l
	6	90 l
	7	116 i
	8	15 c
	9	117 z, 120 g N., 154 a N.
	10	35 g
	11	20 e, 20 g
	12	107 d
	13	20 e, 64 d, 138 g
	14	47 m
	15	107 c
	16	20 e, 67 g, 90 g, 132 c, 138 g, 164 f
	17	20 h, 155 h
	20	47 l, 146 c
	21	20 e
	24	20 c
	26	113 o
16	2	72 ee
	6	112 oo
	7	32 d, 72 ee, 141 l N.
	8	72 ee
	12	88 c
	14	55 k

Exodus

16	16	118 h
	20	27 o, 67 n, 121 d N., 139 h N.
	21	123 c, 159 g
	22	134 e
	23	63 i, 76 d
	29	9 l, 69 p, 139 d
	32	117 cc
	33	125 b
17	1	115 f
	2	47 m
	3	72 ee, 117 e
	4	112 x
	6	49 k
	7	152 k
	12	141 d, 145 n
	14	126 s
18	4	119 i
	5	118 g
	9	75 r
	14	102 b
	18	75 n, 133 c
	20	155 d, 155 i
	21	97 h
	22	127 b
	23	49 i
	26	47 g, 112 g
	27	119 s
19	1	102 f
	3	53 n
	5	113 o
	8	135 r
	13	69 t
	15	134 o N.
	18	93 dd
	19	113 u
	23	72 w, 72 x
20	2	15 p, 138 d
	3	107 o, 132 h
	5	60 b, 129 e
	8	113 bb
	9	118 k
	15	107 o
	18	116 o
	20	135 m, 152 x
	24	127 e
	25	72 k, 117 kk
21	2	159 bb
	4	145 h, 146 e
	5	113 o
	8	61 b, 75 ee, 103 g
	12	104 g, 112 n, 116 w
	13	112 ii
	18	47 m
	20	126 r
	28	117 d, 121 b
	29	124 i
	31	29 i N.
	35	135 m
	36	159 cc

Exodus

21	37	47 <i>f</i> , 123 <i>a</i>
22	1	124 <i>n</i>
	3	51 <i>k</i> , 113 <i>o</i>
	4	53 <i>n</i>
	5	117 <i>q</i>
	8	138 <i>e</i>
	11	113 <i>o</i>
	17	94 <i>d</i>
	22	113 <i>m</i> , 163 <i>c</i> N.
	25	135 <i>o</i>
	29	60 <i>d</i>
	30	131 <i>k</i>
23	4	21 <i>h</i>
	8	107 <i>g</i>
	9	158 <i>a</i>
	16	61 <i>a</i>
	21	51 <i>n</i> , 67 <i>y</i>
	22	113 <i>o</i>
	24	60 <i>b</i>
	26	94 <i>d</i>
	27	117 <i>ii</i> N.
	28	126 <i>t</i>
	30	123 <i>e</i> , 133 <i>k</i>
	31	58 <i>g</i>
24	3	118 <i>q</i>
	4	134 <i>f</i>
	10	139 <i>g</i>
	12	154 <i>a</i> N.
25	5	52 <i>q</i>
	11	49 <i>l</i>
	15	135 <i>o</i> N.
	18	117 <i>hh</i>
	28	117 <i>hh</i>
	29	20 <i>f</i> , 117 <i>hh</i>
	31	63 <i>h</i>
	33	123 <i>d</i>
	35	123 <i>d</i>
	40	121 <i>c</i>
26	2	134 <i>n</i>
	3	123 <i>d</i> , 139 <i>e</i>
	19	123 <i>d</i>
	33	49 <i>h</i> , 53 <i>r</i> , 133 <i>i</i>
27	11	134 <i>n</i>
28	9	117 <i>d</i>
	10	134 <i>c</i> N.
	17	131 <i>d</i>
	20	117 <i>y</i>
	21	139 <i>c</i>
	32	165 <i>a</i>
	43	165 <i>a</i>
29	1	66 <i>g</i>
	2	126 <i>m</i>
	12	119 <i>w</i> N.
	31	128 <i>p</i>
	35	103 <i>b</i>
30	4	103 <i>g</i>
	20	117 <i>y</i> N.
	32	73 <i>f</i>
31	4	63 <i>i</i>
	13	60 <i>f</i>

Exodus

31	17	51 <i>m</i>
	18	124 <i>g</i>
32	1	126 <i>aa</i> , 137 <i>c</i>
	3	54 <i>f</i> , 117 <i>w</i>
	4	72 <i>t</i> , 145 <i>i</i>
	6	52 <i>n</i> , 113 <i>e</i>
	12	150 <i>e</i>
	25	5 <i>n</i> , 58 <i>g</i> , 116 <i>i</i>
	26	137 <i>c</i>
	29	114 <i>p</i>
	30	108 <i>h</i>
	32	159 <i>dd</i> , 167 <i>a</i>
	33	137 <i>c</i>
	34	112 <i>oo</i>
33	3	27 <i>q</i>
	6	54 <i>f</i> , 117 <i>w</i>
	7	107 <i>e</i> , 112 <i>e</i> , 113 <i>h</i>
	10	112 <i>kk</i>
	11	156 <i>c</i>
	12	75 <i>gg</i>
	13	69 <i>b</i> N., 91 <i>k</i>
	14	150 <i>a</i>
	19	67 <i>ee</i>
	20	60 <i>d</i> , 159 <i>gg</i>
	23	124 <i>b</i>
34	1	124 <i>q</i>
	10	122 <i>q</i>
	13	47 <i>m</i>
	19	51 <i>g</i>
	24	51 <i>l</i>
	34	159 <i>k</i>
36	1	103 <i>g</i>
	29	112 <i>ss</i>
38	3	117 <i>hh</i>
	5	95 <i>n</i>
39	17	131 <i>d</i>
	18	60 <i>h</i>
	23	165 <i>a</i>

Leviticus

1	1	49 <i>b</i> N.
	17	156 <i>f</i>
2	1	139 <i>d</i> , 145 <i>t</i>
	2	85 <i>b</i>
	8	144 <i>p</i> N.
4	2	119 <i>w</i> N., 139 <i>d</i>
	23	69 <i>w</i>
5	9	75 <i>hh</i>
	11	131 <i>d</i>
	13	119 <i>w</i> N.
	15	128 <i>d</i>
6	2	91 <i>e</i>
	3	128 <i>d</i>
	7	113 <i>gg</i>
	8	118 <i>g</i> , 135 <i>o</i> N.
	9	118 <i>q</i>
	13	131 <i>c</i>
7	8	117 <i>d</i>
	35	53 <i>l</i> , 155 <i>l</i>

Leviticus

8	11	76 <i>c</i>
	16	91 <i>c</i>
9	6	107 <i>q</i> , 120 <i>c</i>
10	6	109 <i>g</i>
	10	114 <i>p</i>
	19	75 <i>rr</i> , 100 <i>k</i> , 159 <i>g</i>
11	7	67 <i>g</i>
	23	88 <i>f</i>
	35	53 <i>u</i>
	42	5 <i>n</i>
	43	74 <i>k</i>
	44	54 <i>k</i>
13	4	91 <i>e</i>
	19	131 <i>i</i>
	34	127 <i>e</i>
	55	54 <i>h</i>
14	34	101 <i>a</i>
	43	53 <i>l</i>
	46	53 <i>l</i>
	55	54 <i>h</i>
15	29	53 <i>r</i>
16	8	30 <i>n</i>
17	14	145 <i>l</i>
18	7	75 <i>hh</i>
	21	95 <i>q</i> N.
	25	76 <i>h</i>
	27	34 <i>b</i> N.
	28	116 <i>s</i>
19	9	61 <i>d</i> , 142 <i>f</i> N.
	16	118 <i>q</i>
	20	113 <i>w</i>
	28	102 <i>i</i>
20	7	54 <i>k</i>
	10	117 <i>d</i>
	14	117 <i>d</i>
	19	75 <i>hh</i>
21	4	67 <i>t</i>
	9	67 <i>t</i> , 164 <i>d</i>
	21	142 <i>f</i> N.
23	17	14 <i>d</i>
	22	61 <i>d</i>
	39	61 <i>a</i>
	42	126 <i>r</i>
24	5	49 <i>l</i> , 117 <i>ii</i>
	22	134 <i>d</i>
25	5	20 <i>h</i>
	10	134 <i>o</i> N.
	20	159 <i>w</i>
	21	49 <i>l</i> , 75 <i>m</i>
	33	145 <i>u</i> N.
	36	76 <i>i</i>
	48	130 <i>d</i>
26	15	67 <i>dd</i>
	18	52 <i>p</i>
	25	49 <i>l</i>
	33	52 <i>n</i>
	34	67 <i>y</i> , 75 <i>m</i>
	37	118 <i>s</i> N.
	42	128 <i>d</i> , 131 <i>r</i>
	43	67 <i>y</i>

Leviticus

27 2 128 d
23 127 i

Numbers

1 1 49 b N.
2 124 r
47 54 l
2 33 54 l
3 1 52 o, 130 d
9 123 e
26 117 l
46 117 m, 134 k
49 85 t
4 2 113 bb
23 45 g
27 128 v
5 2 102 i
3 119 e
10 117 m, 139 c
17 128 p
19 110 i
20 167 a
22 53 q, 66 f
23 126 s
27 112 y
6 7 74 b, 96
9 133 k N., 144 e
26 109 b
7 2 5 n
11 123 d
8 7 27 q, 64 d
24 45 g
20 131 e
10 3 145 c
4 134 r N.
29 138 b
35 5 n
36 118 f
11 4 35 d, 151 a N.
5 106 g
7 93 h
10 117 h
11 74 k
12 69 s, 122 f N.
15 32 g
16 48 i
17 119 m
20 80 h
25 23 d, 68 f, 72 q,
120 d N., 126 x
27 126 r
29 154 b
12 1 146 g
2 133 k N.
4 97 i
6 128 d
13 105 b N.
14 154 b
13 21 102 f

Numbers

13 27 118 f
32 72 l
14 2 106 p, 151 e
16 69 n, 114 s
17 5 n
21 167 b
24 119 gg
27 72 ee
31 76 h
33 91 l
34 123 d
35 67 g
40 58 k
41 135 p
15 15 161 c
24 119 w
29 143 c
31 51 k
35 113 gg
16 13 54 e
15 117 d
22 100 m, 150 m
29 121 b, 159 c N.,
159 q
17 6 72 w
10 67 t, 72 dd
17 139 c
20 72 ee
25 128 v
27 106 n
28 67 e, 67 dd, 150 g
N.
18 8 143 e
26 72 i
19 12 74 b
20 3 65 a, 154 b
5 59 a, 152 a N.
18 152 w
21 66 i
21 1 75 q
5 59 a
9 117 d
14 127 f
15 112 pp
17 63 l
20 112 ss
23 157 b N.
24 112 pp
27 54 c, 75 hh
30 67 g, 69 r, 76 f
35 164 d
22 1 125 h
6 20 c, 53 u, 67 o,
120 c, 138 e
12 103 c
13 69 x, 115 c
17 67 o
19 109 d, i
29 151 e N.
33 103 b, 117 n

Numbers

22 38 114 m
23 3 130 d, 137 c
6 64 c, 67 o, 93 aa
8 58 g
10 151 a
13 20 o, 48 i, 67 o N.,
69 x, 100 o N.,
152 b
14 118 f
15 51 p
18 90 o, 96
19 27 q, 64 d, 109 i,
166 a
20 159 g
24 124 n
25 10 h, 67 g
24 1 123 c
3 90 o, 96
4 116 k
5 148 b
6 75 x
7 54 c, 93 z
10 113 r
17 55 f
22 29 f
23 115 k
24 93 y
25 12 5 n, 128 d, 131 r N.
26 62 54 l
27 7 135 o
29 39 93 m
31 28 134 d
32 6 150 m
14 69 h
17 72 p
20 159 c N., 167 b
23 47 m, 159 q
30 68 i
32 32 d
42 103 g
34 2 131 f
7 75 bb N.
14 23 c
36 6 135 o

Deuteronomy

1 1 101 a
2 118 g, 134 f
3 134 o
5 120 g, 120 h
7 119 s
13 119 s
16 75 t, 112 u
17 47 m, 53 r, 133 c,
161 c
18 117 gg
19 118 h, 126 v
21 69 f
23 134 f

Deuteronomy

1	24	120 <i>h</i>
	27	115 <i>c</i> , 115 <i>f</i>
	28	124 <i>q</i>
	33	53 <i>q</i>
	34	65 <i>e</i> , 149 <i>b</i>
	40	119 <i>s</i>
	41	135 <i>n</i>
	44	67 <i>g</i> , 67 <i>y</i> , 107 <i>g</i>
	46	138 <i>c</i>
2	9	75 <i>bb</i> , 118 <i>q</i>
	13	119 <i>s</i>
	14	134 <i>h</i>
	23	126 <i>w</i>
	24	20 <i>g</i> , 69 <i>f</i> , 75 <i>cc</i> , 110 <i>h</i> , 120 <i>g</i> , <i>h</i>
	27	108 <i>c</i> , 123 <i>e</i> , 133 <i>k</i> , 156 <i>d</i>
	28	49 <i>m</i>
	31	67 <i>w</i> , 69 <i>f</i>
3	3	164 <i>d</i>
	5	128 <i>c</i>
	11	100 <i>i</i>
	13	125 <i>d N.</i>
	21	126 <i>k</i>
	26	69 <i>v</i>
4	1	44 <i>d</i> , 69 <i>s</i>
	8	128 <i>p</i>
	10	115 <i>d</i> , 165 <i>b</i>
	15	52 <i>o</i> , 130 <i>d</i>
	20	74 <i>l</i>
	21	54 <i>k</i>
	26	51 <i>k</i>
	36	61 <i>d</i>
	39	72 <i>w</i>
	41	90 <i>c</i>
5	3	135 <i>g</i>
	6	15 <i>p</i> , 138 <i>d</i>
	9	60 <i>b</i>
	12	113 <i>bb</i>
	19	120 <i>d N.</i>
	23	132 <i>h</i>
	24	32 <i>h</i>
	26	151 <i>c</i>
6	3	118 <i>g</i> , 165 <i>b</i>
	7	119 <i>l</i>
	11	49 <i>m</i> , 96
	17	58 <i>g</i>
7	5	52 <i>n</i>
	15	60 <i>d</i>
	16	72 <i>r</i> , 109 <i>d</i>
	24	53 <i>l</i>
	25	127 <i>e</i>
8	3	44 <i>l</i> , 72 <i>o</i>
	5	61 <i>h</i>
	9	93 <i>aa</i>
	13	75 <i>u</i>
	14	116 <i>f</i>
	15	127 <i>i</i>
	16	44 <i>l</i> , 72 <i>o</i>
	19	106 <i>i</i>

Deuteronomy

9	7	138 c
	8	54 k
	18	54 k
10	5	29 g
	17	102 m, 126 v, 133 i	
	19	112 aa
	22	119 i
11	2	117 l
	15	49 m
	30	150 e
12	3	52 n
	14	61 h
13	1	109 d
	3	60 b
	6	116 f
	9	109 d
14	17	80 k
15	2	113 gg
	7	119 w N., 139 d	
	14	93 k
	18	128 c, 133 k
16	6	119 g
	13	93 k
	20	133 k
17	2	167 b
	5	124 o
	6	144 e
	8	102 h
	14	44 d, 49 m
	17	109 g
18	1	68 c, 131 h
	16	109 d
20	2	61 d
	5	137 c
	8	121 b
	14	128 h
21	3	121 a, 145 q
	4	121 a
	7	44 m, 145 k
	8	55 k
	10	135 p, 145 m
	11	49 m, 96, 130 e
	13	101 a
22	1	159 gg
	19	17 c, 127 e
	23	131 b
23	5	61 d, 130 c N ¹
	11	20 h
	15	93 ss, 128 p
	25	96
24	1	167 b
	4	54 h
	8	51 n
	10	23 d
	13	58 i
25	2	96, 128 v
	12	67 ee
	13	123 f
26	5	119 i
	12	53 k

Deuteronomy

27	2	72 <i>w</i>
	6	117 <i>hh</i>
	9	16 <i>b</i>
28	24	58 <i>g</i>
	36	131 <i>d</i>
	43	133 <i>k</i>
	48	53 <i>l</i> , 145 <i>m</i>
	49	155 <i>d</i>
	52	67 <i>v</i>
	56	113 <i>d</i> , 142 <i>f</i> N
	57	74
	59	91 <i>n</i>
	62	119 <i>i</i>
	66	75 <i>rr</i>
	67	151 <i>b</i>
29	14	100 <i>o</i> N.
	15	157 <i>c</i>
	18	69 <i>h</i> N.
	21	167 <i>b</i>
	28	5 <i>n</i>
30	4	92 <i>b</i> N.
31	12	120 <i>e</i>
	16	93 <i>gg</i>
	21	164 <i>d</i>
	29	74 <i>g</i>
32	1	2 <i>r</i> , 91 <i>l</i> , 117 <i>b</i>
	3	69 <i>o</i>
	4	126 <i>c</i>
	5	13 <i>c</i> , 152 <i>e</i>
	6	20 <i>g</i> , 75 <i>ll</i> , 100 <i>i</i> , 152 <i>a</i> N.
	7	60 <i>f</i> , 87 <i>n</i> , 123 <i>c</i>
	8	53 <i>k</i> , 109 <i>k</i>
10		58 <i>i</i> , 58 <i>k</i>
11		52 <i>n</i> , 155 <i>g</i>
15	20 <i>g</i> , N (<i>a</i>)	144 <i>p</i> , 154
17	144 <i>p</i> , 152 <i>a</i> N., 155 <i>e</i> , 155 <i>f</i> , 155 <i>h</i>	
18		75 <i>s</i> , 109 <i>k</i>
20		108 <i>a</i>
21		152 <i>a</i> N.
22		69 <i>f</i>
24		116 <i>h</i> , 116 <i>l</i>
26		58 <i>a</i> N., 75 <i>mm</i>
27		139 <i>y</i>
28	50 <i>e</i> , 93 <i>qq</i> ,	124 <i>e</i>
29		159 <i>x</i>
30		134 <i>s</i>
31		156 <i>b</i> N.
32		20 <i>h</i>
35	52 <i>o</i> , 145 <i>o</i> , 155 <i>l</i>	
36	29 <i>v</i> , 44 <i>f</i> ,	152 <i>s</i>
37		29 <i>t</i> , 75 <i>u</i>
39		141 <i>h</i> N ²
40		93 <i>aa</i> N.
41		159 <i>n</i>
46	117 <i>gg</i> ,	165 <i>b</i>
50		110 <i>c</i>
33	2	112 <i>pp</i>

Deuteronomy

33	3	116 s
	4	131 s
	9	19 c, 117 b N.
11	116 i, 117 u, 165 b	
12		44 c
16	48 d, 90 l, 90 m	
19		130 f, 133 h
21		68 h, 76 d
23		48 i, 69 f
24		119 w, 126 m
26		91 l
27		131 s
34	8	67 g
	9	116 f

Joshua

1	1	49 b N.
	2	131 n
	5	106 c
	7	107 p, 135 o N.
	8	91 k
12		125 d N.
2	2	63 i
	4	60 d, 135 p
	5	114 k
	6	59 g
10		117 c, 157 c
13		63 q, 96
15		126 r
16		63 c, 72 q, 74 k
17		34 a N., 59 h
18		59 h
20		126 y
3	5	54 k
	7	115 c
	9	66 c
11		128 c
12		134 q
14		127 g
16		120 g
4	3	72 z
	4	134 k
	6	47 m
	7	9 v
14		52 l
24		74 g
5	2	120 g, 124 q
	8	63 q
8		134 l
9		113 u
13		112 i, 113 t
17		75 oo
22		134 l
7	7	63 p, 113 x, 120 e, 154 b
	9	75 hh
15		121 b
21		127 i, 134 g
24		154 a N.

Joshua

7	25	117 ee
8	11	127 g
	25	146 c
	28	20 g, 117 ii
	33	127 f, 127 i
9	2	118 q
	8	137 a
12	54 f, 72 m, 112 ss, 126 aa	
	20	113 z
	24	75 hh
10	13	107 c, 135 p, 150 e
	17	93 oo
	24	23 i, 138 i
	36	90 e
11	8	126 y
	14	53 l
12	9	2 r
13	5	127 f
	7	125 d N.
	14	145 u N.
14	1	64 d
	7	72 aa, 115 i
	8	75 ii
	11	115 k, 161 c
15	3	112 ss
	5	90 d
	12	90 f
	14	134 l
	18	16 f
	19	117 x, 117 ff, 126 y
	21	90 e
	38	21 e N.
	56	21 e N.
16	2	112 ss
	3	126 y
17	11	97 c, 117 l
18	12	90 i, 112 ss
	13	126 y
	20	47 f
19	11	112 ss
	13	90 i
21	11	91 k
22	3	112 ss
	9	68 i
	17	117 aa
	20	150 m
	25	130 o N.
23	5	60 a
	15	103 b
24	7	145 m
	14	75 oo
	19	124 h, 145 i

Judges

1	1	49 b N.
	2	106 m
	3	49 h
	6	93 r

Judges

1	7	116 k, 121 d, 141 i, 156 b
	12	112 ii
	15	59 h, 126 y
	19	114 l
	22	145 c
	28	113 n, 164 d
1	1	107 b
	18	112 hh
	19	112 e, 112 ee
3	23	112 tt
	24	67 v, 164 b
	25	116 d
	28	129 e
4	4	131 b
	6	150 e
	8	49 m
	18	72 s, 72 t, 126 r
	19	74 k
	20	58 g, 64 f, 110 k, 147 c, 150 n, 152 k
	21	72 p, 72 t
	24	113 h N., 113 u
5	1	2 r, 73 e, 117 b, 146 g
	4	117 z
	5	67 dd, 136 d N.
	7	20 i, 36, 44 h N.
	8	107 b, 149 e
	10	87 e, 130 a
	12	10 g, 72 s
	13	69 g
	14	93 aa
	15	10 g, 87 g, 93 bb
	17	117 bb
	21	118 q
	22	20 h, 123 e
	24	119 w
	26	47 k
	27	154 a N.
	28	64 h
	29	75 w, 128 i, 133 h
6	9	49 c, 49 e
	10	49 e
	11	127 d
	13	159 dd
	14	126 y
	16	49 l
	17	36
	18	114 g, 135 a
	19	53 n, 156 d
	20	34 f
	25	126 w, 128 c
	28	63 p
	31	73 e, 100 m
	36	116 g, 159 v
	39	109 a N.
7	3	137 c
	4	136 b
	6	93 n

Judges

7	8	131 s
12		36
13		112 q
19		113 z
20		147 c
23		102 b
25		124 r
8	1	74 h, 155 d, 155 h
2		20 m
4		118 n
10		97 e
11		130 a N.
18		126 o, 161 c
19		63 q, 159 x
32		125 h, 128 c
9	8	113 o
9	63 k, 100 n, 106 n	
10		46 d, 46 e
15		159 v
16		167 a
17		119 bb
28		137 a
29	48 l, 76 e, 151 b, 154 b	
39		69 p
41		35 d
45		117 ee
48		157 a
53	27 o, 67 p, 125 b	
55		145 d
10	4	96
11		167 b
18		137 c
11	5	21 b
10		159 n N.
18		47 m
20		157 b N.
25	51 i, 133 a N.	
29		118 f
33		134 e
34	135 o, 135 o N.	
35		119 i
36		124 e
39		144 b
12	5	100 m, 112 ee
6		2 w
7		124 o
13	2	125 b
5		80 d
6	44 d, 64 f, 127 e	
8		52 s
12		135 m
16		119 m
21		75 y
23		90 h N.
25		61 c
14	2	90 e
3		135 a
4		122 q, 135 p
6		152 p

Judges

14	15	9 v, 69 n, 150 g
		N.
17		134 m
18	37 d, 90 f, 93 x, 133 a	
15	1	119 n
7		163 c, 163 d N.
12		152 w
13		113 p
14		164 b
18	5	66 h
9		126 o
10		67 dd
11		113 o
13		28 c N.
14		127 g
15		141 e
16	10 g, 52 d, 60 d, 164 d	
18		112 tt
20		123 c
25		52 n
26		67 v
27		126 x
28	34 a N., 88 f, 97 b	
		N.
30		72 r
17	2	32 h, 121 f
3		154 N.
18	3	142 e
19		20 g, 150 g
23		67 g, 67 y
29		52 q
30		5 n
19	1	131 b
2		75 t
5		9 u, 64 c N., 117 ff
6		110 h, 120 d
8		64 c
9		91 k
11		19 i
13		69 x, 73 d
18		118 e N.
20		29 q, 73 e
22		54 c, 130 e
30	112 ee, oo, 116 w	
20	2	29 f
15		54 l, 155 d
16		90 i N.
31		66 f
32		20 h
38		75 gg
39		118 u
43		22 s
44		117 m
21	7	131 n
9		54 l
16		123 b
21		145 p

1 Samuel

1	1	49 b N., 125 b, 125 h, 156 b
2		134 l, 145 o
3		112 dd, 123 c
4		112 g, 126 s
6	20 h, 22 s, 59 g, 117 p	
7		107 e, 123 c
8		37 e, 102 l
9	91 e, 113 e N., 141 e	
10		128 y
11		113 o
12	112 uu, 114 n N., 164 d	
13		20 g
14		47 o
16		128 v
17		23 f, 95 h
20		44 d, 64 f
22		112 oo
24		135 i
27		95 h
28		64 f
2	1	2 r, 106 g
3		103 g, 120 g, 124 e, 133 k, 152 z
4		146 a
6		111 u, 116 x
8		107 g, 116 x, 135 p
9		67 g
13		112 oo, 116 w, 131 c, 159 i, 164 a
14		131 h, 132 g
15		112 oo
16	23 e, 103 g, 106 m, 112 ll, 113 w, 159 f, 159 dd	
18		116 k, 118 q, 121 d
19		112 e
20		145 u
22		112 k
23		126 y
24		116 s
25		117 x
26		113 u
27		113 q, 114 e, 150 e
28		49 e, 113 z, 119 w
29		133 b
30		113 p, 116 g, 149 a
31		112 x, 116 d
33		53 q, 118 q, 145 e
3	2	107 b, 120 b
3		107 c, 152 r
5		46 c, 120 g, 120 h
7		107 c
10		54 k, 118 u, 123 c
11		67 g, 67 p, 116 w, 155 d
12		113 h

1 Samuel

3	13	112 <i>qq</i> , 130 <i>c</i> N., 119 <i>p</i>
	14 149 <i>c</i>
	17 149 <i>d</i>
	21 75 <i>y</i>
4	1 131 <i>c</i> , 145 <i>c</i>
	3 127 <i>g</i>
	5 72 <i>h</i> , 145 <i>c</i>
	6 37 <i>f</i>
	7 125 <i>e</i>
	8	132 <i>h</i> , 136 <i>d</i> , 147 <i>d</i>
	10 124 <i>b</i> , 145 <i>o</i>
	12 127 <i>e</i>
	15	44 <i>m</i> , 145 <i>k</i> , 145 <i>n</i>
	16 126 <i>k</i>
	19 69 <i>m</i> , 112 <i>tt</i>
	21 152 <i>q</i>
5	3 116 <i>d</i>
	7 112 <i>rr</i>
	8 116 <i>w</i>
	9	67 <i>v</i> , 130 <i>d</i> , 164 <i>d</i>
	10 115 <i>c</i> , 145 <i>m</i>
	11 117 <i>e</i>
6	4 118 <i>h</i> , 135 <i>r</i>
	7 135 <i>o</i>
	9	155 <i>d</i> , 155 <i>f</i> , 159 <i>q</i>
	10 60 <i>h</i> , 75 <i>qq</i>
	11 154 <i>a</i> N.
	12	47 <i>k</i> , 71, 75 <i>n</i> , 113 <i>s</i>
	14 127 <i>d</i>
	18 126 <i>x</i>
	19 119 <i>k</i>
7	9 131 <i>k</i>
	10 116 <i>u</i>
	11 119 <i>c</i>
	12 111 <i>d</i>
	14 72 <i>k</i>
	16 112 <i>f</i>
	17 29 <i>i</i> N.
8	11 72 <i>l</i>
	12 114 <i>p</i>
	19 20 <i>g</i> , 163 <i>a</i>
9	2 133 <i>a</i>
	3	96, 117 <i>d</i> , 130 <i>g</i>
	4 104 <i>g</i> , 152 <i>k</i>
	7 159 <i>w</i> N.
	9 107 <i>e</i>
	10 120 <i>g</i>
	11 116 <i>u</i>
	13 35 <i>n</i> , 47 <i>m</i>
	17 138 <i>b</i>
	20	73 <i>e</i> , 134 <i>m</i> , 143 <i>c</i>
	21 133 <i>g</i>
	24 138 <i>i</i> , 138 <i>k</i>
10	3 97 <i>c</i>
	4 134 <i>n</i>
	5	29 <i>g</i> , 101 <i>a</i> , 109 <i>k</i> , 112 <i>z</i>
	6 75 <i>qq</i>

1 Samuel

10	8 112 <i>v</i>
	9 112 <i>uu</i>
	11	20 <i>h</i> , 111 <i>g</i> , 116 <i>s</i> , 116 <i>w</i> , 136 <i>c</i>
	12 154 <i>b</i>
	13 75 <i>qq</i>
	14 152 <i>k</i>
	16 113 <i>o</i>
	18 135 <i>a</i>
	23 133 <i>b</i>
	24 22 <i>s</i> , 100 <i>l</i>
	25 126 <i>s</i>
	27 136 <i>b</i>
11	1 125 <i>h</i>
	2 135 <i>p</i>
	5 107 <i>v</i>
	11 111 <i>g</i> , 116 <i>w</i>
	12 150 <i>a</i>
12	3 137 <i>b</i>
	7 51 <i>p</i>
	13 44 <i>d</i> , 64 <i>f</i>
	14 167 <i>a</i>
	17 114 <i>o</i>
	19 107 <i>p</i>
	20 135 <i>a</i>
	23 126 <i>x</i> , 135 <i>g</i>
	24 75 <i>oo</i>
	25 29 <i>o</i> , 113 <i>o</i>
13	3 2 <i>b</i>
	6 93 <i>w</i>
	7 119 <i>gg</i>
	8 69 <i>t</i>
	11 67 <i>dd</i>
	12 54 <i>k</i>
	13 159 <i>dd</i>
	15 93 <i>oo</i> , 132 <i>g</i>
	17	118 <i>g</i> , 126 <i>l</i> , 126 <i>z</i> , 134 <i>l</i>
	19 152 <i>w</i>
	20 118 <i>e</i>
	21	35 <i>n</i> , 96, 112 <i>dd</i>
	22 112 <i>ee</i>
	23 92 <i>g</i>
14	1 126 <i>s</i>
	13 72 <i>m</i>
	14 118 <i>s</i> N.
	15 95 <i>g</i>
	16 129 <i>b</i>
	19	111 <i>h</i> , 113 <i>u</i> , 164 <i>d</i>
	21 2 <i>b</i>
	22 53 <i>n</i>
	24 76 <i>d</i> , 112 <i>w</i>
	27 72 <i>k</i>
	28 72 <i>t</i>
	29 126 <i>x</i>
	30	106 <i>p</i> , 113 <i>o</i> , 159 <i>x</i>
	33 23 <i>c</i> , 74 <i>i</i> , 75 <i>oo</i>
	34 96
	36	48 <i>g</i> N., 67 <i>dd</i> , 109 <i>d</i>
	38 66 <i>c</i>

1 Samuel

14	39 100 <i>o</i> N., 149 <i>c</i>
	43 113 <i>p</i>
	44 149 <i>d</i>
	45 119 <i>w</i> N.
	49 47 <i>b</i>
	52 112 <i>ll</i>
15	1 9 <i>v</i>
	2 106 <i>g</i>
	4 93 <i>x</i>
	5 68 <i>i</i>
	6	20 <i>g</i> , 22 <i>s</i> , 60 <i>f</i> , 68 <i>h</i> , 154 <i>a</i> N.
	9	67 <i>t</i> , 75 <i>y</i> , 132 <i>d</i> , 135 <i>c</i>
	13 121 <i>f</i>
	14 37 <i>f</i> , 154 <i>b</i>
	16 165 <i>a</i>
	19 72 <i>ff</i>
	20 157 <i>c</i>
	23	29 <i>q</i> , 53 <i>l</i> , 111 <i>h</i> , 119 <i>x</i>
	32 118 <i>q</i>
	33 119 <i>w</i>
16	1 65 <i>h</i> , 127 <i>d</i>
	2 114 <i>g</i> , 159 <i>g</i>
	3 138 <i>e</i>
	4	141 <i>n</i> , 145 <i>u</i> , 150 <i>a</i>
	7 35 <i>g</i> , 132 <i>c</i>
	8 125 <i>i</i>
	11 133 <i>g</i>
	12 128 <i>x</i>
	14 112 <i>h</i>
	16	120 <i>b</i> N., 124 <i>i</i>
	18 128 <i>t</i> , 129 <i>c</i>
	20 128 <i>q</i>
	23	112 <i>ee</i> , 112 <i>oo</i> , 126 <i>x</i>
17	5 121 <i>d</i> , 131 <i>q</i>
	12 126 <i>x</i>
	14 133 <i>g</i> , 134 <i>l</i>
	15 113 <i>u</i> , 118 <i>g</i>
	16 113 <i>k</i>
	17 126 <i>x</i> , 134 <i>n</i>
	20 112 <i>rr</i>
	21 122 <i>i</i>
	24 111 <i>h</i>
	25	22 <i>s</i> , 53 <i>n</i> , 60 <i>g</i> , 100 <i>l</i> , 114 <i>g</i> , 116 <i>s</i>
	26 34 <i>f</i> , 132 <i>h</i>
	28 136 <i>c</i>
	32 112 <i>p</i>
	34	112 <i>kk</i> , 126 <i>r</i> , 154 <i>a</i> N.
	38 112 <i>tt</i>
	40 132 <i>c</i>
	41 113 <i>u</i>
	43 124 <i>o</i>
	46 145 <i>e</i>
	47 53 <i>q</i> , 145 <i>c</i>
	48 112 <i>uu</i>

1 Samuel

17 50 111 *k*
 55 . . . 126 *aa*, 136 *c*,
 137 *b*
 58 . . . 126 *e*, 126 *f*
 18 1 60 *d*
 9 55 *c*
 10 . . . 54 *e*, 118 *u*
 15 157 *c*
 18 137 *a*
 19 . . . 114 *q*, 115 *e* *N*
 21 134 *r*
 22 59 *c*
 23 114 *a*
 28 . . . 59 *g*, 59 *i*
 29 . . . 68 *h*, 69 *n*
 19 1 115 *a*
 2 51 *n*, 63 *c*
 3 119 *l*
 10 126 *y*
 13 . . . 124 *h*, 132 *h* *N*
 17 59 *h*, 150 *e*
 22 126 *x*
 23 . . . 113 *t*, 135 *g*
 20 1 37 *d*, 116 *s*
 2 103 *g*, 156 *f*
 3 . . . 118 *x*, 149 *a* *N*
 6 51 *e*, 51 *i*, 113 *n*,
 159 *s*
 8 142 *g*
 9 150 *a*
 10 . . . 150 *i*, 151 *a*
 11 118 *f*
 13 . . . 117 *l* *N*., 149 *d*
 16 117 *g*
 19 120 *c*
 20 127 *e*
 23 143 *a*
 26 152 *d*
 27 80 *g* *N*
 31 . . . 128 *v*, 138 *c*
 33 115 *c*
 37 150 *e*
 40 72 *y*
 42 . . . 134 *d*, 135 *f*
 21 2 90 *i*, 119 *gg*, 152 *o*
 3 55 *b*, 137 *c*
 5 119 *e* *N*
 6 123 *b*
 8 129 *h*
 9 150 *c* *N*³
 10 . . . 102 *g*, 126 *r*
 14 60 *d*, 75 *bb*, 131 *m*
N
 16 150 *b*
 22 2 75 *oo*
 5 119 *s*
 7 117 *n*, 124 *p*, 153
 9 90 *i*
 13 113 *e*
 15 . . . 67 *w*, 150 *b*

1 Samuel

23 1 93 *r*
 7 128 *a*
 10 . . . 113 *o*, 117 *n*
 11 . . . 150 *g* *N*., 150 *n*
 15 90 *e*
 19 150 *e*
 21 121 *f*
 22 63 *n*, 135 *b*, 144 *d*
*N*²
 23 100 *o* *N*
 28 22 *s*
 24 5 138 *b*
 6 117 *d*
 11 9 *v*, 112 *rr*, 144 *o*
 12 114 *r*, 154 *N* (c)
 18 117 *ff*
 19 . . . 112 *hh* *N*., 117 *c*
 25 1 21 *d*
 2 67 *cc*
 5 44 *d*, 64 *f*
 7 53 *p*
 8 . . . 72 *o*, 74 *k*, 76 *g*
 10 . . . 67 *ee*, 126 *w*
 11 112 *cc*
 14 72 *ff*
 15 130 *d*
 18 . . . 24 *b*, 75 *v*, 132 *g*
 20 . . . 47 *k*, 112 *uu*
 22 149 *b*
 24 135 *g*
 25 107 *p*
 26 65 *f*, 113 *e*, 113 *gg*,
 144 *l* *N*³, 149 *a* *N*
 27 143 *d*, 145 *o*, 145 *o*
*N*¹
 28 119 *w* *N*
 29 143 *c*
 31 114 *p*
 33 75 *qq*
 34 76 *h*, 106 *p*, 149 *d*
 28 9 . . . 112 *h*, 151 *a*
 12 87 *s*, 152 *l*
 13 156 *c*
 14 155 *m*
 16 . . . 117 *l*, 117 *m* *N*
 19 72 *aa*
 20 117 *d*
 22 127 *f*
 27 9 . . . 112 *e*, 112 *dd*
 10 150 *a* *N*
 28 3 . . . 106 *f*, 154 *a* *N*
 7 52 *d*, 96, 128 *u*,
 130 *e*
 8 10 *h*, 46 *e*
 10 20 *h*
 13 132 *h* *N* . I
 15 48 *d*, 59 *f*, 75 *ll*,
 102 *l*
 24 68 *h*
 29 6 149 *c*

1 Samuel

29 8 . . . 49 *m*, 130 *c*
 10 144 *c*
 30 2 156 *f*
 6 144 *b*
 8 . . . 150 *a* *N*¹, 154 *a*
 13 134 *o* *N*¹
 24 161 *c*
 26 91 *k*
 28 10 *g*
 31 2 53 *n*
 7 103 *g*
 9 124 *r*

2 Samuel

1 4 157 *c*
 6 75 *rr*, 113 *o*
 9 72 *m*, 128 *e*
 10 49 *c*, 61 *b*, 107 *b* *N*
 18 150 *e*
 21 126 *m*, 130 *a*, 152 *g*
 23 . . . 44 *c*, 154 *a* *N*
 24 116 *f*
 25 148 *b*
 26 75 *oo*
 2 5 121 *f*
 16 144 *d*
 20 136 *d*
 21 64 *c*, 119 *s*
 22 . . . 102 *l*, 150 *e*
 23 . . . 111 *g*, 116 *w*
 26 44 *g*
 27 159 *ee*
 32 . . . 72 *r*, 118 *g*
 3 1 . . . 113 *u*, 145 *c*
 2 129 *g*
 8 75 *qq*, 111 *e*
 10 114 *o*
 11 115 *d*
 16 113 *u*
 18 113 *dd* *N*
 25 117 *h*
 27 117 *ll*
 30 117 *n*
 33 107 *t*
 34 . . . 152 *d*, 152 *e*
 39 141 *e*
 4 1 145 *p*
 2 128 *c*
 4 128 *h*
 7 141 *e*
 10 . . . 111 *h*, 114 *l* *N*
 11 117 *d*
 5 2 74 *k*
 6 35 *g*, 106 *m*
 8 35 *g*, 167 *a*
 10 125 *h*
 21 146 *f*
 24 109 *k*, 112 *z*, 117 *d*
 6 1 68 *h*

2 Samuel

6	2	125 c
	3	126 z
	6	117 g
	16	112 uu
	20	75 y, 148 b
7	5	112 r, 150 d
	14	112 mm
	29	120 d
8	2	126 m
	3	17 b
	4	69 v
	8	131 e
9	1	165 a
	3	128 y, 152 s
10	7	131 b
	9	145 h, 146 a
	12	54 k
11	1	23 g
	4	141 e
	11	149 a N.
	19	142 f N ²
	20	157 c
	24	69 r, 75 rr
	25	117 l
	27	60 d
12	1	72 p
	2	126 d, 126 x, 146 f
	3	152 p
	6	97 h
	9	144 n
	10	114 g
	14	52 o
	15	51 m
	16	112 f, 117 q
	17	75 rr
	28	61 f, 135 a, 150 m N.
	30	127 e
13	4	p. 457 N ¹
	5	75 cc
	8	72 t
	12	75 hh, 107 g
	14	117 u
	15	117 q
	17	64 c
	18	47 l, 112 tt N., 156 b
	19	113 t
	20	84 a s, 118 p, 154 a N
	23	131 d
	25	152 g, 165 a
	26	159 dd
	28	72 w, 159 g
	31	116 k
	32	73 f
	39	131 g, 144 o
14	2	75 m, 136 d
	3	76 g
	4	126 e
	6	60 d

2 Samuel

14	7	73 b
	10	116 w
	11	75 ff, 119 w N.
	13	92 b, 115 i
	19	47 b N., 70 c
	21	106 m
	26	118 h, 134 g
	30	71
	31	102 l
15	2	111 g, 127 b N.
	4	112 p, 151 a
	5	10 g N ³
	7	10 g
	12	113 u
	16	117 d
	20	150 a
	21	93 aa N., 130 c, 163 d
	23	117 t
	25	117 e
	27	72 s
	32	116 k, 121 d
	33	49 l, 75 w
	34	67 dd, 143 d
	37	93 ll
16	1	134 n
	5	112 tt, 113 t
	7	128 t
	13	93 gg, 112 f
17	5	135 f
	8	117 h
	9	144 e
	10	67 t
	11	106 i
	12	109 d, 122 l
	13	106 o
	15	135 a
	16	121 a
	17	112 k, 126 r
	22	96, 130 g
	23	51 m
	26	118 g
18	3	63 i, 97 g
	11	114 l, 119 aa, 154 b, 159 w N.
	12	137 c, 154 b
	13	159 cc
	14	108 c, 156 c
	16	22 s
	18	117 d
	19	119 ff
	22	74 i
	23	110 b
	29	114 f, 150 a
	33	133 l N.
19	1	135 f, 151 b
	6	70 c, 128 a
	13	112 i
	14	68 h
	18	97 e, 112 tt

2 Samuel

19	19	53 g
	20	115 g
	25	52 l, 127 f
	27	122 f
	30	106 i
	43	76 b
	44	67 w
20	1	147 c
	5	68 i
	8	142 e
	9	68 h, 141 c
	11	137 c
	12	112 oo, 116 e
	13	69 w
	14	125 h
	18	113 w
	19	130 f N.
	20	149 a, 149 e
	21	53 s, 155 e
	23	16 b, 127 f
21	2	74 h
	3	110 i
	4	120 c
	9	118 i
	11	121 a
	12	75 rr
	15	72 t
	20	35 n
	22	121 b
22	1	2 s, 53 l, 130 d
	24	49 e
	27	67 l
	33	35 d, 131 r
	37	103 d
	38	108 e
	40	68 k
	41	19 i, 116 w
	44	87 f
23	1	2 s, 29 g
	3	116 w
	4	152 u
	5	135 m, 150 a N.
	6	91 f, 143 a
	7	113 w
	8	47 b, 87 f
	11	127 e
	13	134 k
	17	167 a
	19	150 d
24	3	145 n, 154 b
	6	90 i
	11	93 rr
	13	145 h
	16	142 f
	21	165 a
	22	93 pp
	23	106 m
	24	75 n, 113 p

1 Kings

1	1	49 <i>b</i> , 67 <i>g</i>
	2	131 <i>b</i> , 144 <i>f</i>
	5	116 <i>o</i>
	6	119 <i>w N</i> .
	12	117 <i>p</i>
	14	116 <i>u</i>
	15	80 <i>d</i> , 90 <i>c</i>
	20	135 <i>g</i>
	21	146 <i>d</i>
	24	150 <i>a</i> , 150 <i>b</i>
	26	135 <i>g</i>
	27	150 <i>f</i>
	31	156 <i>c</i>
	40	117 <i>q</i> , 145 <i>c</i>
	41	146 <i>a</i>
	47	70 <i>e</i>
	52	119 <i>w N</i> .
2	2	116 <i>p</i>
	3	95 <i>u</i> , 114 <i>o</i>
	6	109 <i>d</i>
	7	116 <i>h</i>
	17	131 <i>g</i>
	18	135 <i>a</i>
	21	121 <i>b</i>
	22	110 <i>a</i> , 154 <i>b</i>
	23	149 <i>d</i>
	26	75 <i>z</i> , 93 <i>ss</i> , 118 <i>f</i> , 128 <i>t</i>
	30	75 <i>ll</i>
	31	128 <i>w</i>
	36	80 <i>i</i> , 90 <i>i</i>
	40	90 <i>i</i>
	42	72 <i>aa</i>
	43	128 <i>h</i>
3	4	107 <i>b</i>
	7	114 <i>c</i>
	8	166 <i>b</i>
	11	112 <i>tt</i>
	12	166 <i>b</i>
	15	71
	16	107 <i>c</i>
	18	128 <i>f</i> , 135 <i>r</i>
	26	46 <i>e</i>
4	5	93 <i>ll</i>
	7	112 <i>l</i>
	12	90 <i>i</i>
	13	128 <i>c</i>
	14	90 <i>d</i>
5	1	144 <i>i</i>
	3	131 <i>c</i>
	7	112 <i>dd</i>
	9	131 <i>e</i>
	12	134 <i>g</i>
	17	117 <i>h</i>
	20	68 <i>c</i>
	25	23 <i>f</i> , 107 <i>e</i>
	29	131 <i>b</i>
6	1	134 <i>h</i> , 134 <i>o</i>
	6	63 <i>i</i>
	7	131 <i>c</i>

1 Kings

6	16	117 <i>d</i>
	19	66 <i>i</i>
7	6	92 <i>g</i>
	7	118 <i>p</i> , 126 <i>w</i>
	8	118 <i>g</i>
	14	41 <i>o</i> , 131 <i>b</i>
	15	117 <i>hh</i>
	27	134 <i>l</i>
	28	20 <i>m</i>
	37	91 <i>f</i>
8	1	107 <i>c</i> , 109 <i>k</i>
	5	119 <i>z</i> , 145 <i>c</i>
	12	138 <i>e</i>
	13	118 <i>k</i>
	29	91 <i>k</i>
	30	119 <i>g</i> , 159 <i>g</i>
	31	145 <i>o</i>
	32	118 <i>g</i>
	33	158 <i>d</i>
	44	75 <i>w</i>
	46	49 <i>m</i>
	48	44 <i>i</i>
	64	133 <i>c</i>
9	3	75 <i>w</i>
	8	67 <i>g</i>
	11	75 <i>oo</i>
	17	126 <i>y</i>
	25	112 <i>dd</i> , 113 <i>z</i>
	26	122 <i>t</i>
10	9	115 <i>d</i>
	11	35 <i>m</i>
	12	117 <i>ii</i>
	21	152 <i>y N</i> .
	22	74 <i>i</i>
	23	119 <i>u</i>
	24	164 <i>b N</i> .
	27	126 <i>p</i>
	29	75 <i>t</i>
11	1	10 <i>h</i>
	3	145 <i>o</i> , 145 <i>p</i>
	5	122 <i>f</i>
	8	131 <i>h N</i> .
	9	138 <i>k</i>
	12	135 <i>p</i>
	15	52 <i>f</i>
	16	53 <i>l</i>
	19	54 <i>k</i>
	21	165 <i>a</i>
	25	117 <i>m N</i> .
	30	117 <i>ii</i>
	31	134 <i>l</i>
	33	87 <i>e</i>
	34	117 <i>ii</i>
	39	23 <i>d</i>
	41	150 <i>e</i>
12	2	138 <i>d</i>
	6	64 <i>b</i> , 117 <i>gg</i>
	8	116 <i>q</i> , 118 <i>q</i>
	10	93 <i>q</i>
	12	74 <i>k</i>

1 Kings

12	15	115 <i>a</i>
	28	133 <i>c</i>
	31	117 <i>d</i>
	32	21 <i>d</i> , 65 <i>e</i> , 112 <i>pp</i>
13	3	112 <i>tt</i>
	7	10 <i>h</i>
	11	125 <i>b</i>
	12	155 <i>d</i>
	14	126 <i>r</i>
	18	156 <i>d</i>
	30	147 <i>d</i>
	33	109 <i>f</i> , 109 <i>g</i>
14	2	32 <i>h</i>
	3	65 <i>g</i>
	5	94 <i>d</i> , 112 <i>z</i>
	6	118 <i>p</i> , 121 <i>d N</i> ¹
	10	64 <i>d</i>
	12	72 <i>r N</i> .
	13	129 <i>g</i>
	14	136 <i>d N</i> .
	15	91 <i>n</i>
	16	23 <i>c</i>
	17	116 <i>u</i>
	19	129 <i>d</i> , 150 <i>e</i>
	21	10 <i>g</i>
	24	127 <i>g</i>
15	13	119 <i>x</i>
	23	118 <i>q</i>
	25	134 <i>p</i>
16	2	74 <i>l</i>
	10	134 <i>o</i>
	24	29 <i>f</i> , 88 <i>b</i>
	25	67 <i>x</i>
	31	150 <i>d</i>
17	1	93 <i>pp</i>
	3	119 <i>s</i>
	9	90 <i>i</i>
	11	66 <i>g</i>
	13	75 <i>m</i>
	14	66 <i>i</i> , 75 <i>rr</i>
	15	32 <i>l</i>
	16	146 <i>a</i>
18	5	119 <i>w N</i> .
	10	107 <i>e</i>
	27	53 <i>q</i> , 67 <i>y</i>
	32	117 <i>ii</i> , 117 <i>kk</i>
	43	152 <i>p</i>
	44	58 <i>g</i>
19	4	157 <i>c</i>
	9	126 <i>r</i>
	11	132 <i>d</i>
	15	26 <i>h</i> , 90 <i>c</i> , 90 <i>i</i>
	19	134 <i>o</i>
	20	20 <i>m</i>
	21	131 <i>m</i>
20	14	137 <i>b</i>
	20	145 <i>c</i>
	21	112 <i>tt</i>
	22	54 <i>k</i>
	25	103 <i>b</i>

1 Kings

20	27	54 <i>l</i>
33		53 <i>n</i>
35		75 <i>mm</i> , 128 <i>v</i>
39		51 <i>k</i>
40		116 <i>g</i> N.
21	2	34 <i>c</i>
8		124 <i>b</i> N.
10		104 <i>g</i>
11		116 <i>q</i> , 118 <i>q</i>
12		112 <i>qq</i>
13		119 <i>c</i>
15		69 <i>f</i>
19		74 <i>k</i> , 135 <i>f</i>
21		74 <i>k</i> , 74 <i>l</i>
25		72 <i>w</i>
22	3	150 <i>e</i>
4		161 <i>c</i>
7		108 <i>b</i>
10		121 <i>d</i>
12		110 <i>f</i>
15		150 <i>c</i>
16		102 <i>k</i> , 134 <i>r</i>
23		126 <i>y</i>
25		75 <i>pp</i>
27		131 <i>c</i>
28		135 <i>r</i> , 144 <i>p</i> , 159 <i>q</i>
30		104 <i>g</i> , 113 <i>dd</i> N.
35		71
49		44 <i>m</i>

2 Kings

1	1	49 <i>b</i>
	2	126 <i>y</i>
	3	152 <i>y</i>
	7	37 <i>f</i>
	9	97 <i>i</i>
	10	154 <i>b</i>
	11	120 <i>d</i>
■	1	10 <i>h</i> , 114 <i>q</i>
	9	107 <i>c</i>
	10	52 <i>s</i> , 114 <i>n</i> N.
	16	93 <i>u</i> , 107 <i>q</i> N ³
	20	72 <i>aa</i>
	21	75 <i>oo</i>
	22	75 <i>qq</i>
	24	122 <i>e</i>
3	3	135 <i>p</i>
	4	2 <i>d</i> , 112 <i>h</i> , 131 <i>k</i>
	8	155 <i>d</i>
	15	112 <i>uu</i>
	16	113 <i>bb</i> , 123 <i>e</i>
	23	113 <i>w</i>
	24	75 <i>ff</i>
	25	112 <i>e</i>
	27	107 <i>k</i>
4	1	125 <i>b</i>
	3	91 <i>l</i> , 133 <i>c</i> N.
	8	126 <i>s</i>
	13	114 <i>k</i> , 117 <i>r</i>

2 Kings

4	14	154 <i>b</i>
	16	32 <i>h</i> , 116 <i>p</i>
	23	90 <i>n</i>
	24	66 <i>c</i>
	25	34 <i>f</i>
	27	63 <i>e</i>
	31	29 <i>k</i>
	41	69 <i>f</i>
	43	113 <i>ee</i>
5	2	118 <i>q</i>
	3	151 <i>e</i>
	9	129 <i>d</i>
	10	110 <i>i</i> , 113 <i>bb</i> , 159 <i>d</i>
	11	112 <i>p</i>
	12	107 <i>t</i>
	13	110 <i>f</i> , 142 <i>f</i> , 159 <i>cc</i>
	17	104 <i>g</i> , 159 <i>dd</i>
	18	75 <i>kk</i>
	20	112 <i>gg</i> , 163 <i>d</i>
	22	136 <i>d</i>
	23	72 <i>t</i> , 88 <i>b</i> , 131 <i>d</i>
	26	150 <i>a</i> N ¹
6	5	117 <i>m</i> N.
	8	91 <i>n</i>
	9	51 <i>n</i>
	10	134 <i>r</i>
	11	36
	19	34 <i>b</i> N ³ , 52 <i>n</i>
	22	p. 457 N ¹
	27	109 <i>h</i> , 150 <i>q</i>
	29	74 <i>l</i>
	32	22 <i>s</i> , 100 <i>l</i>
7	1	131 <i>d</i>
	4	112 <i>ff</i>
	8	47 <i>i</i>
	10	135 <i>p</i> N ¹
	13	127 <i>f</i>
	18	10 <i>h</i>
8	1	32 <i>h</i>
	6	53 <i>m</i> , 72 <i>y</i> , 91 <i>e</i>
	8	126 <i>y</i>
	16	52 <i>l</i>
	17	134 <i>e</i>
	21	50 <i>e</i>
9	2	72 <i>w</i> , 76 <i>h</i>
	4	127 <i>g</i>
	17	80 <i>f</i>
	18	32 <i>n</i> , 103 <i>o</i> , 119 <i>b</i>
	19	150 <i>a</i> N ¹
	27	147 <i>c</i>
	31	144 <i>p</i>
	33	76 <i>c</i>
	35	119 <i>m</i>
	37	75 <i>m</i>
10	1	124 <i>b</i> N., 127 <i>f</i>
	6	131 <i>h</i> N.
	15	159 <i>cc</i>
	21	102 <i>h</i>
	23	152 <i>w</i>
	29	93 <i>o</i>

2 Kings

11	1	112 <i>pp</i>
	2	116 <i>e</i>
	4	75 <i>gg</i> , 75 <i>q</i> , 97 <i>g</i>
	5	116 <i>h</i>
	12	74 <i>l</i>
	13	87 <i>e</i>
	15	113 <i>cc</i> , 119 <i>e</i>
12	9	72 <i>h</i> , 66 <i>g</i> , 93 <i>h</i>
	12	112 <i>pp</i> N ³
13	6	74 <i>k</i>
	17	69 <i>r</i> , 76 <i>f</i>
	19	114 <i>k</i> , 159 <i>dd</i>
	21	111 <i>g</i>
14	7	21 <i>e</i> , 112 <i>tt</i>
	8	156 <i>o</i>
	14	93 <i>oo</i> , 112 <i>pp</i> , 112 <i>tt</i> , 124 <i>q</i>
15	16	76 <i>c</i> , 127 <i>i</i>
	29	80 <i>k</i>
16	4	65 <i>e</i>
	7	72 <i>p</i>
	14	127 <i>h</i>
	17	127 <i>h</i>
	18	80 <i>k</i>
17	4	118 <i>u</i>
	6	134 <i>p</i>
	11	53 <i>p</i>
	15	103 <i>l</i>
	29	124 <i>r</i>
18	1	134 <i>p</i>
	4	112 <i>tt</i>
	17	128 <i>w</i> N.
	20	44 <i>i</i>
	26	2 <i>a</i>
	28	2 <i>a</i>
	29	74 <i>l</i>
	30	121 <i>b</i> N.
	36	112 <i>tt</i>
19	2	131 <i>h</i> N.
	4	132 <i>h</i>
	14	124 <i>b</i> N.
	21	72 <i>l</i>
	25	23 <i>f</i> , 75 <i>qq</i>
20	1	49 <i>a</i>
	19	126 <i>x</i> , 141 <i>n</i>
21	11	74 <i>l</i>
	12	67 <i>g</i>
	13	113 <i>h</i> N.
	15	112 <i>tt</i>
	26	144 <i>d</i> N.
22	1	134 <i>e</i>
	13	138 <i>b</i>
	20	61 <i>h</i> , 124 <i>c</i>
23	3	127 <i>c</i>
	4	75 <i>v</i> , 112 <i>pp</i> , 112 <i>pp</i> N.
	8	112 <i>pp</i> N.
	10	112 <i>pp</i> , 114 <i>s</i>
	12	112 <i>rr</i> , 127 <i>f</i>
	14	112 <i>pp</i> N.

■ Kings

23	15	67 v
	17	127 f, 127 g
	20	117 d
	35	139 c
24	7	144 b
	14	97 g, 112 tt
25	9	117 d
	15	123 e
	16	126 z, 134 l
	17	134 e
	18	131 b
	19	127 f
	28	122 q
	29	75 rr

Isaiah

1	2	126 e
	3	124 i
	4	128 l, x, 147 d
	5	37 e, 127 c, 137 b,	156 d
	6	67 m, 126 m, 144 b,	152 o
	7	116 l, 116 n, 118 x,	143 a
	9	106 p, 118 x, 159 x	
11	106 g, 107 f, 117 z		
12	. 51 l, 106 g, 164 d		
14	66 b, 76 b, 102 h,	114 c, 119 aa	
15	60 f, 61 e, 117 z,	124 n, 145 n	
16	. . . 54 d, 128 r		
17	. . . 113 d, 117 u		
18	. . . 126 o, 160 a		
19	120 e	
20	. . . 52 e, 121 c		
21	90 l, 95 h, 107 b,	148 b	
22	126 m	
23	. . . 107 g, 124 f		
24	51 p	
25	. . . 118 w, 124 l		
26	. 118 s N., 135 m		
27	116 i	
28	147 c	
29	144 p	
30	. 91 d, 116 i, 152 o		
31	93 q	
2	1	154 a N.
	2	116 r
	4	91 n
	6	44 g
	7	117 z
	8	145 m
	9	. . . 109 e, 117 g	
11	. . . 112 s, 146 a		
17	145 o	
18	15 f	

Isaiah

2	20	63 i, 84 ^b n, 135 n,	145 m
	22	116 e, 119 s
3	1	116 p, 122 v
	3	116 k
	6	103 g, 118 g
	7	117 g, 117 ii, 156 b	
	8	53 q, 122 i
	9	135 i, 156 g
	12	124 k, 145 l
	13	115 b
	14	128 h, 154 b
	15	37 c
	16	52 n, 75 v, 111 r,	112 nn, 113 u, 135 o
	17	. 91 c, 91 f, 142 f	
	22	35 f
	24	131 b
4	4	106 o, 107 l, 113 e,	159 n N.
5	1	87 f N., 108 b,	128 v
	2	. . . 114 m, 117 ee	
	3	110 a
	4	75 z, 114 k, 150 m	
	5	112 u, 113 d, 113 f,	114 k N., 116 d,
		116 p	
	6	117 z, 117 ii, 119 y	
	8	112 w, 116 x, 144 p,	147 d
	9	. . . 149 e, 152 y	
	10	93 m
	11	112 m, 120 c, 130 a,	156 d
	12	93 ss, 106 l, 141 d	
	13	. . . 106 n, 128 t	
	14	. . . 20 f, 112 s	
	15	111 w
	17	. . . 118 t, 142 f	
	19	. . . 48 d, 108 d	
	23	. . . 116 x, 145 m	
	24	. . . 114 r, 115 k	
	25	136 b
	26	. 133 k N., 145 m	
	28	. . . 20 h, 117 z	
	29	152 l
	30	136 b
6	1	111 b
	2	88 f, 119 cc, 134 q	
	3	112 k, 133 k, 139 e	N., 141 l
	4	107 b, 107 d, 117 z	
	5	106 n, 128 y, 147 d	
	6	94 b, 155 h, 156 b	
	7	112 x
	8	61 g, 117 c, 124 g	N., 137 b
	9	. . . 75 n, 113 r	
10	67 v, 136 b	

Isaiah

6	11	106 o, 121 d, 144 d,	152 y
	12	67 k
	13	52 p, 112 mm,	114 k N., 120 d
7	2	72 q, 122 i
	3	95 s
	4	113 bb
	6	122 i
	7	. . . 122 q, 144 b	
	8	119 y
	9	. . . 148 d, 159 ee	
	11	29 u
	13	. . . 114 a, 133 c	
	14	74 g, 112 t, 113 h,	126 r, 135 a N.,
		135 c	
	15	113 f
	17	49 a
	18	124 e
	20	126 x
	23	134 n
	25	. . . 118 l, 144 h	
8	1	29 l, 52 s, 119 u	
	2	49 e, 96
	4	144 d
	6	. 2 d N., 130 a	
	7	154 b
	8	145 o
	9	110 f
	11	. . . 45 d, 59 h	
	12	. . . 47 m, 117 r	
	16	67 n
	17	75 z
	19	164 d
	20	145 m
	21	. . . 54 k, 118 n	
	23	67 v, 90 f, 128 h	
9	1	106 n, 130 a, 132 g	
	2	. . . 103 g, 130 a	
	3	10 h, 20 h, 67 w,	93 q, 118 u, 135 n
	4	112 mm, 124 n,	143 d, 146 e
	5	. . . 93 k, 144 d	
	6	. . . 5 n, 152 u	
	8	. . . 127 c, 145 c	
	11	127 c
	12	116 f
	18	145 o
10	1	. . . 10 g, 93 bb	
	2	114 r
	4	163 c
	5	152 a
	9	21 d
	10	133 e
	12	. . . 47 b, 127 a	
	13	23 d, 75 z, 107 b N.	
	14	118 w, 126 o, 132 e	
	15	115 i, 124 k, 150 h	

Isaiah

10 16 69*f*
 17 93*v*
 18 67*cc*
 22 117*z*
 24 . 58*i*, 119*o*, 156*d*
 30 . . 132*b*, 144*m*
 32 . . 114*k*, 119*o*
 33 23*t*
 11 2 128*a*
 7 122*e*
 8 142*f*
 9 106*u*, 114*c*, 115*d*,
 116*f* N., 117*n*,
 126*z*
 10 119*gg*
 12 20*m*
 14 93*hh*
 12 1 109*k*
 2 80*g*
 5 116*e*
 6 122*s*
 13 3 135*n*
 4 . . . 146*b*, 147*c*
 6 118*x*
 8 . . . 47*m*, 119*gg*
 18 52*n*
 19 115*d*
 20 68*k*
 22 145*o*
 14 2 54*f*, 57 N², 117*w*
 3 22*s*, 102*b*, 115*g*,
 121*b*, 121*f*
 4 . 49*k*, 49*m*, 148*b*
 6 . . . 117*q*, 130*a*
 9 145*t*
 11 . . . 93*ss*, 145*o*
 14 87*s*
 17 . . . 116*x*, 117*o*
 19 . 29*f*, 126*p*, 130*a*
 23 . . . 55*f*, 113*e*
 24 . . . 144*b*, 149*b*
 27 . . . 116*q*, 126*k*
 30 . . . 72*w*, 133*h*
 31 . . . 72*v*, 113*bb*
 15 2 70*d*, 96
 5 72*cc*
 7 155*h*
 8 119*hh*
 16 2 126*p*
 4 145*d*
 6 122*v*
 7 70*d*
 8 . . . 75*m*, 145*u*
 9 75*dd*
 10 72*bb*, 121*a*, *b*, 144*e*
 17 1 . . . 119*x*, 121*b*
 4 128*r*
 5 122*n*
 6 118*u*, 131*n* N¹,
 134*s*

Isaiah

17 8 . 35*f*, 154*a* N. (*b*)
 10 . . . 20*m* N., 47*k*
 11 72*n*
 12 47*m*, 75*u*
 18 1 124*e*
 2 52*s*, 103*m*
 3 66*b*
 4 10*h*
 5 29*q*, 67*v*, 72*dd*,
 142*f*, 145*q*
 6 73*b*
 19 1 72*l*
 3 67*dd*
 4 . . . 124*i*, 132*h*
 6 . 53*g*, 53*p*, 124*e*
 9 86*i*
 10 128*y*
 11 133*h*
 12 109*f*
 13 142*f*
 17 . 80*h*, 95*d*, 143*b*
 18 2*a*
 22 113*s*
 20 1 115*k*
 2 . . . 113*i*, 118*n*
 4 . . . 87*g*, 118*o*
 21 1 114*o*
 2 . 44*o*, 72*s*, 121*b*
 7 . . . 93*dd*, 117*q*
 8 118*r*
 9 136*d*
 11 . 90*f*, 93*w*, 116*t*
 12 29*t*, 75*u*, 75*rr*,
 76*d*
 14 76*d*
 17 127*a*, 128*a*,
 146*a*
 22 1 . . . 91*e*, 150*l*
 2 75*v*, 91*e*, 117*z*,
 126*e*, 128*x*, 152*d*
 3 119*w*
 5 . . . 128*a*, 133*l*
 7 128*r*
 10 20*m*
 11 . . . 95*o*, 124*k*
 13 75*n*, 113*d*, 113*f*,
 113*dd*
 14 107*c*, 112*ss*, 149*b*,
 149*e*
 16 . . . 90*m*, 144*p*
 17 113*r*
 18 118*r*
 19 144*p*
 24 . . . 128*w*, 133*h*
 23 1 . . . 110*k*, 119*y*
 4 152*z*
 5 . . . 118*u*, 128*h*
 7 . . . 126*z* N.
 8 93*pp*
 11 . . . 20*o*, 53*q*

Isaiah

23 12 . 35*b*, 46*e*, 118*f*,
 130*e*, 132*b*
 13 136*d* N.
 15 . 44*f*, 116*p*, 118*t*
 17 . . . 72*l*, 91*e*
 24 2 . 35*g*, 116*s*, 127*i*
 3 67*t*
 10 119*x*
 12 121*d*
 16 117*q*
 19 . . . 67*o*, 113*w*
 22 117*q*
 25 6 . . . 75*dd*, 93*ss*
 7 72*p*
 10 72*v*
 26 4 . . . 119*i* N.
 9 144*m*
 10 159*c*
 11 47*m*
 16 . . . 44*l*, 72*o*
 18 124*e*
 19 . . . 95*h*, 122*s*
 20 75*qq*
 27 3 60*a*
 4 10*h*, 65*b*, 71,
 117*x*, 151*b*
 5 162*a*
 8 55*f*
 9 156*f*
 11 . . . 70*a* N., 124*e*
 18 152*x*
 28 1 . . . 124*e*, 128*c*
 2 125*c*
 3 47*k*
 4 91*e*, 128*w*, 135*n*,
 144*e*
 6 . . . 90*i*, 119*hh*
 7 . . . 72*l*, 118*g*
 8 127*c*
 9 130*a*
 10 . . . 102*h*, 147*c*
 11 116*b*
 12 . . . 23*i*, 114*m* N.
 16 71, 119*i*, 130*f*
 N., 155*f*
 17 . . . 29*u*, 142*f*
 18 145*o*
 20 133*c*
 21 . . . 118*t*, 132*b*
 24 144*e*
 26 112*rr*
 27 152*z*
 28 112*m*, 113*w* N.
 150*a*
 29 1 19*c*, 66*f*, 69*h* N.,
 130*d*
 4 120*g*
 5 . . . 126*p*, 133*k* N.
 6 . . . 84*a*, 144*b*
 7 . 75*qq*, 116*i*, 118*t*

Isaiah

29	8	116 s
	9	55 g, 72 l
	13	115 d, 127 a, 142 d	
	14	. 50 e, 113 w, 155 f	
	15	53 q, 112 n
	16	147 c, 150 f
	19	128 l, 132 c, 133 h	
	23	131 o
30	1	69 h N.
	2	63 i, 72 q
	5	78 b
	6	135 p
	8	61 f, 135 p
	11	102 b
	12	61 d, 111 v, 114 d, 114 r	
	13	116 d
	14	. 63 i, 113 i, 156 g	
	18	67 cc, 130 a
	19	. 58 g, 67 n, 75 ll	
	20	131 c, 145 n
	21	56
	22	135 n, 145 m
	23	93 ss
	24	52 s
	25	74 i
	26	114 r, 134 r
	28	72 z
	31	156 d
	33	32 l
31	2	141 f
	3	75 u
	5	67 p, 113 t
	6	. 138 f N., 144 p	
	8	125 c, 152 a
32	1	143 e
	7	154 a N.
	9	44 o
	11	. 48 i, 67 o, 110 k	
	12	116 s, 144 i
	13	128 c
	17	113 c
	18	124 e
33	1	20 h, 53 q, 53 u, 67 v, 120 b, 156 f	
	3	67 dd
	4	85 h
	5	116 s
	6	130 b
	7	75 u
	9	29 q, 145 t
	10	54 c, 133 l
	12	20 i
	14	84 ^a s, 117 bb
	15	117 r N., 119 z, 124 e	
	16	124 b
	20	152 t
34	4	67 t, 126 o
	5	52 k

Isaiah

34	6	54 h
	10	102 i
	11	21 c, 80 g
	13	117 z
	17	59 g
35	1	47 n
	2	117 q, 130 b
	4	65 f
	7	135 p
	9	84 ^b f, 132 c
	2	128 w N.
36	8	127 f
	9	119 s, 119 u
	11	2 a
	14	74 l
	16	110 f, 127 f
	17	114 r
37	3	69 m, 152 k
	11	150 a
	14	124 b N.
	17	10 g
	19	113 f, 113 z
	22	130 e
	24	128 r
	25	124 e
	26	75 qq, 114 k, 117 ii	
	28	114 c
	29	112 nn
	30	113 z, 113 ee, 126 b	
38	3	16 f N., 157 c
	5	50 e, 113 bb, 155 f	
	9	114 r
	10	108 g, 121 d
	14	. 48 i N., 61 f N.	
	15	55 g
	16	75 mm, 103 g, 135 p	
	17	119 ff
	18	116 h, 152 z
	20	86 i, 114 i
39	1	124 b N.
	2	15 e N., 126 x
40	1	107 f
	3	146 b
	4	93 v
	6	112 qq, 127 c
	9	119 s
	10	119 i
	11	93 x
	14	124 e
	18	15 c, 75 dd
	19	119 hh
	20	155 f, 156 g
	22	126 b
	25	150 m
	26	124 e
	29	152 v
	30	69 q
	31	8 k
41	1	119 gg
	2	35 n N., 75 gg, 155 n	

Isaiah

41	3	118 q
	4	135 a N.
	5	75 u
	7	29 f
	8	138 d
	10	75 bb
	12	135 n
	15	96
	17	20 i
	23	48 g N., 75 l, 75 v, 109 d	
	24	155 n
	25	23 d, 76 d
	28	. 109 h, cf. 159 d	
42	4	67 q
	5	. 65 d, 93 ss, 124 k	
	6	. 107 b N., 109 k	
	13	126 p
	18	35 g, 126 e, 126 f	
	20	75 n, 144 p
	21	120 c
	22	29 q, 72 y, 119 hh, 124 q	
	24	113 d, 114 m N., 138 g	
	25	131 k
43	1	. 61 h, 74 e, 91 d	
	2	. . 159 dd, 159 ff	
	6	122 v
	8	. 53 m, 69 v, 74 l	
	9	. 51 o, 106 n N ²	
	10	135 a N.
	25	141 h
44	3	71
	9	5 n
	13	64 i
	15	. . 66 e, 103 f N.	
	16	67 ee
	19	150 a
	21	20 f, 57 N., 117 x	
	24	65 d
	28	53 n, 114 p
45	1	67 p
	2	70 b
	4	. 111 b N., 131 g	
	9	152 u
	10	47 o
	14	10 g
46	5	75 dd
47	1	120 c
	2	46 d, 63 l
	5	. 100 g N ³ , 118 o	
	7	94 g
	8	90 l, 144 p
	10	59 g, 61 h, 75 v, 116 f	
	12	138 f
	14	28 b, 67 cc
48	8	52 k, 157 a
	9	119 hh

Isaiah

48	11	67 t
	14	119 <i>hh</i>
	17	61 <i>h</i> , 93 <i>qq</i>
	18	111 <i>x</i> , 151 <i>e</i>
49	6 67 <i>t</i> , 115 <i>a</i> , 142 <i>f</i>	
	N ²	
	7	111 <i>q</i>
	11	145 <i>u</i>
	13	126 <i>o</i>
	15	160 <i>b</i>
	18	32 <i>c</i>
	19	67 <i>dd</i>
	21	72 <i>p</i>
	23	122 <i>f</i> N., 156 <i>c</i>
	26	135 <i>l</i>
50	2 133 <i>c</i> , 150 <i>m</i> , 152 <i>y</i>	
	8	15 <i>c</i> , 20 <i>f</i>
	9	136 <i>c</i>
	10	137 <i>c</i>
	11	20 <i>n</i>
51	1	155 <i>k</i>
	2	107 <i>b</i> N.
	3	146 <i>e</i>
	9 72 <i>s</i> , 118 <i>u</i> , 124 <i>q</i>	
	10	93 <i>pp</i> , 138 <i>k</i>
	12	61 <i>h</i> , 111 <i>m</i>
	13	52 <i>k</i>
	15	65 <i>d</i>
	17	128 <i>q</i>
	19	47 <i>b</i> , 122 <i>q</i>
	21	50 <i>f</i> , 130 <i>b</i>
52	1	120 <i>c</i>
	5	55 <i>b</i>
	7	75 <i>x</i> , 106 <i>g</i>
	8	117 <i>a</i> N ² , 146 <i>b</i>
	11	67 <i>t</i>
	12	61 <i>h</i>
	14	93 <i>q</i>
53	1	151 <i>a</i>
	2	166 <i>a</i>
	3	96, 128 <i>q</i>
	4	116 <i>l</i> , 117 <i>ii</i>
	5	121 <i>a</i> , 128 <i>q</i>
	8	103 <i>f</i> N.
	9	160 <i>c</i>
	10	74 <i>k</i> , 75 <i>ii</i>
	11 117 <i>n</i> , 120 <i>h</i> , 132 <i>b</i>	
54	1 67 <i>f</i> , 144 <i>p</i> , 155 <i>f</i>	
	4	91 <i>l</i>
	5	124 <i>k</i> , 124 <i>k</i> N.
	6	58 <i>g</i>
	10	103 <i>b</i>
	11	152 <i>a</i> N.
	12	21 <i>d</i>
	14	54 <i>c</i> , 110 <i>c</i>
	15	137 <i>c</i> , 159 <i>w</i>
55	2	152 <i>a</i> N.
	3	93 <i>m</i>
	9	161 <i>b</i>
56	3	138 <i>k</i>

Isaiah

56	4	138 <i>f</i>
	5	112 <i>mn</i>
	8	20 <i>m</i>
	9	29 <i>t</i>
	12	29 <i>t</i>
57	4	93 <i>m</i>
	5	67 <i>u</i>
	6	20 <i>h</i>
	8	47 <i>k</i>
	17	113 <i>h</i>
	20	113 <i>d</i>
58	3 19 <i>c</i> , 20 <i>h</i> , 150 <i>m</i>	
	9	115 <i>b</i>
	13	119 <i>hh</i>
59	3	51 <i>h</i>
	5	73 <i>d</i> , 80 <i>i</i>
	9	93 <i>r</i>
	10	152 <i>v</i>
	12	67 <i>k</i>
	13	52 <i>e</i> , 75 <i>n</i> , 113 <i>d</i>
	14	72 <i>ee</i>
	21	143 <i>a</i>
60	3	107 <i>b</i> N.
	4	51 <i>m</i> , 122 <i>v</i>
	7	60 <i>e</i>
	9	58 <i>g</i>
	14	118 <i>q</i> , 125 <i>h</i>
61	1	84 <i>n</i>
	7	119 <i>hh</i>
62	2	16 <i>f</i>
	9	20 <i>m</i> , 52 <i>p</i>
	12	152 <i>a</i> N.
63	3	53 <i>p</i> , 76 <i>c</i>
	11	128 <i>c</i>
	16	60 <i>d</i>
	19	151 <i>e</i> , 155 <i>m</i>
64	3	75 <i>hh</i>
	6	72 <i>cc</i>
65	1	51 <i>c</i> , 155 <i>n</i>
	2	126 <i>z</i>
	5	117 <i>x</i>
	11	35 <i>g</i>
	14	70 <i>d</i>
	17	29 <i>i</i> N., 51 <i>m</i>
	18	110 <i>c</i>
	20	75 <i>oo</i>
	24	107 <i>c</i>
66	13	155 <i>d</i>
	15	119 <i>i</i>
	18	167 <i>b</i>

Jeremiah

1	10	45 <i>g</i>
	13	90 <i>e</i>
2	2	49 <i>k</i>
	8	155 <i>n</i>
	11	72 <i>e</i> , 155 <i>n</i>
	12	46 <i>d</i>
	15	44 <i>m</i>

Jeremiah

2	16	117 <i>u</i>
	17	116 <i>g</i> N.
	19	60 <i>a</i>
	20	44 <i>h</i> N.
	21	126 <i>z</i>
	24	60 <i>e</i> , 122 <i>d</i>
	27	59 <i>h</i> , 69 <i>s</i>
	31	85 <i>h</i>
	33	44 <i>h</i>
	35	114 <i>d</i>
	36	68 <i>h</i>
3	1	113 <i>ee</i> , 159 <i>w</i>
	5	47 <i>k</i> , 66 <i>f</i> , 69 <i>r</i>
	6	75 <i>ii</i> , 132 <i>b</i>
	7	84 ^a <i>k</i>
	8	91 <i>l</i>
	9	112 <i>ss</i>
	15	113 <i>h</i>
	22	75 <i>pp</i> , 75 <i>rr</i>
4	1	143 <i>d</i>
	2	10 <i>g</i>
	5	120 <i>h</i>
	7	20 <i>h</i> , 93 <i>t</i>
	11	67 <i>v</i>
	13	67 <i>ee</i>
	18	75 <i>n</i>
	19 44 <i>h</i> , 108 <i>g</i> , 133 <i>l</i>	
	N.	
	30	145 <i>t</i>
5	6	20 <i>b</i> , 67 <i>cc</i>
	7	65 <i>b</i>
	13	52 <i>o</i> , 138 <i>i</i>
	22	58 <i>i</i> , 58 <i>k</i> , 60 <i>e</i>
	26	67 <i>p</i>
6	5	10 <i>g</i>
	8	51 <i>c</i> , 152 <i>a</i> N.
	10	108 <i>g</i>
	17	112 <i>dd</i>
	20	126 <i>x</i>
	28	133 <i>i</i>
	29	67 <i>u</i>
7	4	133 <i>l</i> N.
	9	112 <i>o</i> , 113 <i>ee</i>
	19	57 N ⁴ , 135 <i>k</i>
8	4	150 <i>m</i>
	5	128 <i>c</i>
	11	75 <i>qq</i> , 133 <i>l</i>
	13	72 <i>aa</i> , 113 <i>w</i>
	14	67 <i>dd</i>
	19	100 <i>m</i> , 102 <i>m</i>
9	1	108 <i>f</i> , 151 <i>b</i>
	2	53 <i>n</i> , 119 <i>u</i>
	3	63 <i>c</i>
	4	53 <i>q</i> , 113 <i>d</i>
	11	109 <i>i</i>
	12	114 <i>r</i>
	17	74 <i>k</i>
	23 113 <i>d</i> , 113 <i>g</i> , 144 <i>e</i>	
10	3	145 <i>u</i> N ³
	4	109 <i>g</i>

Jeremiah

10 5 23 *i*, 47 *n*, 75 *oo*,
 113 *b*
 11 1 *c*
 17 46 *d*, 90 *m*
 18 67 *ee*
 19 63 *c*, 126 *y*
 22 146 *b*
 23 72 *z*
 11 7 113 *k*
 15 53 *n*, 90 *g*, 91 *e*
 16 84^{*a*} *a*
 19 45 *g*
 12 4 145 *k*
 5 55 *h*
 9 68 *i*
 13 10 52 *s*
 14 127 *e*
 16 144 *c*
 17 69 *p*
 19 75 *m*, 118 *q*
 20 145 *m*
 21 64 *a*
 14 1 138 *e N*.
 16 103 *g*
 18 155 *h*, 159 *p*
 15 10 61 *h*, 91 *c N*.
 18 50 *f*, 102 *l*
 16 16 73 *b*, 132 *b*
 17 2 28 *a*, 45 *g*
 7 93 *oo*
 11 161 *a*
 17 75 *hh*
 18 53 *m*, 72 *y*, 74 *l*
 18 7 45 *g*
 16 119 *q*
 23 75 *ii*
 19 5 144 *b*
 11 75 *qq*
 15 74 *k*
 20 9 21 *d*, 112 *kk*, 132 *d*
 15 59 *f*
 17 111 *l*, 122 *n N*.
 21 1 115 *t*
 13 66 *f*
 22 14 87 *g*
 15 10 *g*, 55 *h*, 142 *g*
 16 144 *p*
 19 113 *h*
 20 10 *h*, 46 *d*
 22 22 *s*
 23 23 *f N*., 80 *d*, 90 *n*
 24 58 *i*
 26 72 *k*
 28 10 *g*
 29 133 *l N*.
 23 6 20 *d*, 60 *c*, 74 *e*
 9 126 *p*
 14 113 *h N*², 152 *x*
 32 52 *s*
 33 117 *m N*.

Jeremiah

23 37 58 *g*, 75 *u*
 39 23 *l*
 24 7 115 *c*
 25 3 53 *k*
 15 131 *k*
 26 127 *g*
 27 76 *h*
 34 91 *l*
 36 24 *e*
 26 5 113 *k*
 6 8 *k*, 37 *b*
 9 75 *qq*
 27 16 90 *e*
 18 72 *o*, 76 *g*
 20 53 *q*
 29 1 53 *p*
 8 53 *o*
 17 132 *e*
 23 64 *e*
 25 124 *b N*.
 30 11 113 *n*
 16 67 *s*
 26 134 *m*
 31 1 75 *hh*
 2 113 *dd*
 3 117 *x*
 8 119 *q*
 15 145 *m*
 18 51 *c*
 21 44 *h*, 126 *y*
 22 47 *o*
 28 45 *g*
 32 63 *o*, 138 *b N*.
 33 60 *a*
 38 17 *b*
 40 127 *g*
 32 4 51 *k*
 10 126 *s*
 12 127 *h*
 14 124 *b N*.
 35 74 *k*
 33 20 128 *d*, 131 *r*
 22 116 *g*
 34 9 132 *d*
 36 33 117 *l*
 37 3 53 *q*
 11 112 *uu*
 12 53 *q*
 13 112 *tt*
 16 87 *i*
 38 4 75 *rr*
 6 127 *f*
 9 111 *l*
 11 8 *k*
 12 93 *x*
 14 126 *w*
 16 17 *b*
 23 144 *i*
 26 115 *a*
 28 112 *qq*

Jeremiah

39 7 53 *q*, 72 *z*
 12 22 *s*
 14 115 *c*
 40 3 112 *qq*
 4 35 *d*
 5 72 *s*
 16 75 *hh*
 41 6 113 *u*
 12 119 *g*
 42 2 75 *ff*
 6 17 *a*, 32 *d*
 10 19 *i*
 16 112 *y*
 44 7 114 *o*
 8 8 *k*
 18 67 *c*
 19 53 *k*, 58 *g*, 144 *u*
 21 52 *o*
 23 74 *g*
 25 72 *k*, 146 *g*
 46 1 138 *e N*.
 5 117 *q*
 8 68 *i*
 16 126 *w*
 20 84^{*b*} *n*
 47 4 45 *g*, 67 *cc*
 48 2 67 *t*
 11 72 *dd*
 15 145 *u*
 31 70 *d*
 32 127 *f*
 36 80 *g*
 44 131 *n N*¹
 45 119 *w*
 49 3 54 *b*
 8 46 *a N*²
 10 75 *pp*
 11 47 *k*, 60 *a N*.
 12 141 *h*
 16 90 *l*, 147 *c*
 25 80 *g*
 28 20 *b*, 67 *cc*
 30 20 *g*
 36 20 *m*
 37 67 *aa*
 50 5 51 *o*
 11 80 *h*
 34 53 *l*, 73 *d*
 51 3 17 *b*, 152 *h N*.
 9 75 *qq*
 13 90 *n*
 14 163 *d*
 29 111 *w N*.
 33 53 *l*
 56 20 *h*, 52 *k*
 58 20 *i*
 59 134 *p*
 52 12 155 *d*
 20 128 *d*

Ezekiel	Ezekiel	Ezekiel
1 6 . . . 87 t, 88 f	16 50 47 l	26 2 67 t
11 91 l	51 96	10 130 b
14 113 s N.	52 52 p, 91 n, 95 p, 96	14 47 k
20 123 d N ²	53 91 e, 91 f	15 51 l
2 3 126 x	54 103 b	17 52 s, 138 k
10 19 h	55 72 k	21 10 g
3 3 49 e	57 72 p	27 3 90 m
15 67 cc, 154 a N. (b)	59 44 i	7 121 b
4 9 87 e	17 5 19 i, 66 g	19 20 i
12 58 k, 95 e	7 52 d	31 80 h
11 72 r, 109 d	9 45 e, 93 m, 150 a	32 23 k
12 52 n, 75 hh	N ¹	34 116 g N.
13 54 c	15 29 i, 93 rr	35 117 q
16 109 d	19 67 v	28 4 32 g
3 93 v	21 117 m	16 23 d, 68 k, 75 qq,
6 67 p N., 67 dd	18 6 131 c	III w N.
8 91 l	7 131 r	17 75 n
9 72 dd	10 119 w N., 139 d	23 55 d
10 119 ii	14 103 l	24 72 p
11 128 c	28 75 t	29 3 117 x, 124 e
12 91 e	29 145 u	7 127 c
14 133 l	32 139 d	30 9 93 y
7 7 127 g	19 1 124 e	12 124 e
14 72 z, 113 z N.	2 80 h	16 73 d
24 93 oo	12 53 u	31 3 67 v
8 2 90 f	20 9 67 t	5 44 f
3 75 qq	16 117 m	7 76 f
16 75 kk	22 112 tt	16 128 a N ¹
9 2 116 k	37 23 f	32 12 51 n
3 116 k, 121 d N ¹	38 145 u	19 46 a N ²
7 112 tt	41 119 i	30 20 m, 72 n
8 64 i	21 12 67 t	32 53 s
11 116 k	15 75 n	33 17 143 a N ³
10 3 131 n, 131 n N ²	18 64 d	26 44 k
15 72 dd	21 73 a	34 2 57 N ⁴
17 72 q, 72 dd	22 124 o	8 57 N ⁴
11 3 150 a N ¹	29 53 l	10 57 N ⁴ , 149 c, 167 b
13 150 a N ¹	31 113 bb N ⁸	21 103 b
24 90 c	32 133 l	31 32 i
18 2 93 oo	33 45 e, 68 i	35 6 10 h
3 152 x, 155 n	35 72 y	9 72 k
11 35 m	22 4 47 k	10 117 m
18 87 f, 103 f N ²	20 66 f	12 84 b e
19 72 k, 93 r	23 5 63 m	36 3 67 r, 75 y, 113 g
20 32 i, 91 l	20 48 d	5 91 e
14 3 51 k, 51 p	28 91 e, 138 e	11 70 e
14 112 ll	32 47 k	12 69 s
22 117 l, 126 w	42 21 c	25 34 f
16 4 22 s, 52 q, 53 s,	44 96	32 152 d
64 e, 71	45 103 b	37 2 112 pp
5 71	47 103 b	7 60 a N.
6 123 d N ²	48 55 k, 91 f	8 9 u, 29 i
10 49 c	49 74 k, 76 b, 144 a	11 116 t, 119 s
27 131 r	24 11 67 q	16 66 g, 119 u
31 91 l	19 75 m	17 52 n, 64 h
32 117 d	26 53 e, 54 k	19 117 m N.
33 20 l, 64 c	25 3 67 u	38 21 49 l
34 121 a	4 91 e	23 54 k
45 96	6 23 c, 74 e	39 2 55 f
47 103 m	15 117 q	9 66 e

Ezekiel

39	26	.	.	.	75 qq
40	3	.	.	.	74 l
	4	.	.	.	74 d
	5	.	.	.	134 n
	16	.	.	.	91 l
	17	.	.	.	121 d
	19	.	.	.	80 k
	27	.	.	.	134 g
	28	.	.	.	126 w
	31	.	.	.	93 ss
	43	.	.	.	20 m
	45	.	.	.	136 d N.
	48	.	.	.	92 g
41	7	.	.	.	67 dd
	15	.	.	.	91 l
	18	.	.	.	121 d
	20	.	.	.	5 n
	22	.	.	.	141 b
	25	.	.	.	131 n N ¹
42	5	.	.	.	68 h, 131 n
43	7	.	.	.	117 m
	17	.	.	.	103 o
	27	.	.	.	75 rr
44	3	.	.	.	117 m
	8	.	.	.	58 g
	9	.	.	.	93 hh, 143 e
	12	.	.	.	112 e N.
45	2	.	.	.	65 d
	12	.	.	.	97 e
	16	.	.	.	127 g
46	6	.	.	.	132 g N.
	9	.	.	.	93 q
	17	.	.	.	72 o
	19	.	.	.	127 f
	22	.	.	.	53 q, 53 s
	23	.	.	.	121 d
	24	.	.	.	124 r
47	3	.	.	.	128 n
	4	.	.	.	131 e
	7	.	.	.	91 e
	8	.	.	.	75 oo
	15	.	.	.	127 f and N.
	17	.	.	.	117 m
48	14	.	.	.	72 dd

Hosea

1	2	.	.	.	52 o, 130 d
	6	.	.	.	120 c, 152 a N.
	7	.	.	.	119 o
2	1	.	.	.	130 c
	3	.	.	.	96
	5	.	.	.	72 w
	6	.	.	.	52 n
	11	.	.	.	120 e
	14	.	.	.	91 e
	21	.	.	.	133 l
	25	.	.	.	152 a N.
3	1	.	.	.	125 c
	2	.	.	.	20 h

Hosea

3	5	.	.	.	2 v N.
4	2	.	.	.	113 ff
	3	.	.	.	119 i
	8	.	.	.	145 m
	14	.	.	.	155 f
	15	.	.	.	145 m
	16	.	.	.	150 a
	18	.	.	.	55 e
5	2	.	.	.	64 a
	3	.	.	.	135 a
	8	.	.	.	147 c
	15	.	.	.	60 e
6	1	.	.	.	109 k
	2	.	.	.	119 y N., 134 s
	3	.	.	.	155 g
	4	.	.	.	120 g
	6	.	.	.	119 w, 133 b
	9	.	.	.	23 l, 75 aa, 93 s
	10	.	.	.	114 l
7	2	.	.	.	157 a
	4	.	.	.	80 k
	5	.	.	.	93 ss
	6	.	.	.	91 c
	12	.	.	.	24 f, 70 b
	14	.	.	.	70 d
	16	.	.	.	34 b N.
8	3	.	.	.	60 d
	4	.	.	.	67 v
	7	.	.	.	90 f
	9	.	.	.	119 s
	10	.	.	.	20 g, 111 w N.
9	6	.	.	.	130 a
	9	.	.	.	120 g
	11	.	.	.	69 m
	12	.	.	.	159 m
	15	.	.	.	109 d
10	4	.	.	.	75 n
	6	.	.	.	121 w
	10	.	.	.	60 a, 71
	11	.	.	.	90 l
	14	.	.	.	9 b, 23 g, 53 u, 72 p, 156 c
	15	.	.	.	133 i
11	1	.	.	.	68 f
	3	.	.	.	19 i, 55 h, 66 g
	4	.	.	.	68 c
	7	.	.	.	75 rr
12	1	.	.	.	124 h
	5	.	.	.	58 k
	11	.	.	.	112 dd
	14	.	.	.	118 h
13	2	.	.	.	91 e, 128 l
	3	.	.	.	120 g
	8	.	.	.	122 e
	10	.	.	.	150 l
	14	.	.	.	93 q
	15	.	.	.	75 rr
14	1	.	.	.	84 a, 145 u
	3	.	.	.	128 e
	4	.	.	.	68 f

Hosea

14	5	.	.	.	118 g
	10	.	.	.	69 b, 166 a N.

Joel

1	2	.	.	.	100 n, 126 e, 150 g
	4	.	.	.	49 m
	5	.	.	.	126 e
	6	.	.	.	152 v
	7	.	.	.	113 n
	8	.	.	.	63 l, 116 k
	12	.	.	.	102 b
	15	.	.	.	147 d
	17	.	.	.	20 h
	18	.	.	.	148 a
	20	.	.	.	145 k
2	2	.	.	.	109 d
	4	.	.	.	72 u, 126 p
	6	.	.	.	23 d
	13	.	.	.	152 g
	16	.	.	.	128 y
	17	.	.	.	150 e
	21	.	.	.	46 e
	22	.	.	.	144 a
	24	.	.	.	93 r
	26	.	.	.	114 o
4	1	.	.	.	125 k
	3	.	.	.	69 u
	4	.	.	.	133 k
	11	.	.	.	51 o, 64 h
	14	.	.	.	123 e, 147 c
	18	.	.	.	117 z
	21	.	.	.	49 k, 75 z

Amos

1	3	.	.	.	134 s, 158 c
	5	.	.	.	145 c
	8	.	.	.	145 e
	9	.	.	.	114 r, 158 c
	11	.	.	.	58 g, 112 i, 114 r
2	6	.	.	.	61 b
	7	.	.	.	126 b
	9	.	.	.	53 n
	10	.	.	.	69 x
	12	.	.	.	51 n
	16	.	.	.	118 n
3	4	.	.	.	163 c
	5	.	.	.	113 q
	7	.	.	.	163 c
	8	.	.	.	159 h
	9	.	.	.	124 e
	11	.	.	.	67 i, 154 a N.
	12	.	.	.	88 f, 126 r
	13	.	.	.	125 h
4	1	.	.	.	135 o, 144 a
	2	.	.	.	75 oo, 112 x
	3	.	.	.	44 k
	4	.	.	.	113 z
	7	.	.	.	112 h N., 144 c

Amos

- 4 8 134 s
 9 126 n
 10 154 a N.
 11 115 d
 13 29 e N., 116 g N.
 5 2 128 k
 3 117 z, 129 g
 4 110 f
 5 122 h
 7 126 b
 8 111 u, 117 ii
 11 61 e
 14 109 k, 152 g
 15 67 cc
 18 152 d
 19 112 m, 126 r
 21 20 h, 106 g, 154 a
 N.
 26 112 x, 112 rr
 6 1 112 n
 2 125 h, 126 y
 6 63 c, 93 k, 119 m
 N.
 10 114 l, 145 m, 152 s
 12 123 a N., 144 d
 13 152 a N.
 14 125 c
 7 1 86 i, 147 b
 2 112 uu
 4 112 tt
 7 156 b
 14 128 v
 15 119 b
 8 4 53 q
 8 125 e
 9 49 l
 10 128 h, 135 p
 13 54 k, 146 g
 9 1 61 g, 144 e
 3 112 p
 7 150 e
 8 53 k, 113 n, 113 v
 11 116 d, 118 u
 13 54 k

Obadiah

- 3 90 l, 93 x
 10 128 h
 11 9 v, 61 f, 69 u
 13 47 k

Jonah

- 1 3 116 d, 122 t, 135 p
 5 51 m
 6 120 b
 7 150 k
 9 2 b
 10 117 q
 11 113 u, 165 a

Jonah

- 1 14 16 f
 15 61 c
 2 2 122 s
 4 117 r
 3 5 133 g
 4 1 117 q
 2 16 f, 114 n N.
 6 117 q
 9 113 k
 10 96, 128 v
 11 20 m, 97 b, 150 a

Micah

- 1 1 145 m
 2 109 k, 135 r, 144 p
 5 23 c, 137 a
 7 52 l, 67 y, 117 ii
 8 69 b N., 118 n
 10 113 v
 11 122 s, 131 c, 145 m
 13 110 k
 15 70 k
 3 3 118 q
 4 67 u, 144 d, 148 b
 6 72 dd, 145 o
 7 100 n, 118 n
 8 72 p, 116 h
 12 72 k, 127 i
 3 1 114 l, 150 e
 4 109 k
 6 119 w, 144 c
 12 87 e, 121 d
 4 3 91 n, 145 c
 6 68 h, 84 a s, 122 s
 8 68 f
 9 117 q
 10 10 k, 76 g, 145 n
 11 119 dd
 12 90 i
 13 44 h, 72 q, 117 ii
 14 119 o
 5 1 135 g, 142 g
 2 106 o, 155 l
 4 72 i, 128 l, 134 s
 6 1 138 e
 3 53 p, 75 ee, 163 b
 5 117 gg
 8 163 d
 9 146 b
 10 47 b, 118 g
 11 47 b
 13 115 c
 7 1 93 p
 2 117 ff, 119 i, 152 k
 3 135 f
 4 133 e, 133 g
 8 122 s
 10 75 p, 75 w, 75 hh
 145 n

Micah

- 7 11 126 x
 12 126 aa
 14 90 m
 17 116 h
 18 148 c
 19 129 g

Nahum

- 1 2 5 h, 128 u
 3 75 hh, 143 a
 4 69 u
 5 126 k
 12 67 t
 2 4 52 q
 5 55 g, 93 ss
 8 63 p, 91 c
 9 130 d N.
 11 67 t, 133 l
 14 91 l
 3 5 53 p
 7 52 q, 67 cc
 8 70 e, 133 b
 9 91 e
 10 69 u
 11 145 p
 15 110 a, 110 k
 17 20 h

Habakkuk

- 1 5 116 s
 6 13 c, 155 e
 8 67 ee
 11 138 h
 14 152 u
 15 63 p
 16 103 g
 17 114 k, 156 g
 1 1 37 b
 3 72 dd
 6 147 c
 10 116 s, 118 p
 12 112 n
 14 90 n, 116 f N.,
 155 g
 15 90 m, 113 z
 17 20 n, 60 d, 67 v
 19 100 g N., 152 p
 3 2 75 mm
 6 67 k, 67 ee
 8 131 r
 9 117 q
 10 91 l
 13 22 s, 75 aa, 75 n,
 113 h
 15 144 m
 17 95 f, 145 u
 19 86 i

Zephaniah

1	2 .	72 <i>aa</i> , 113 <i>w</i> N.
	14	52 <i>s</i>
2	2	152 <i>y</i>
	7	135 <i>p</i>
	9	8 <i>k</i>
	15	152 <i>s</i>
3	1	75 <i>rr</i>
	7	120 <i>g</i>
	11	135 <i>n</i>
	16	145 <i>p</i>
	18	69 <i>t</i>
	20	91 <i>l</i>

Haggai

1	1	129 <i>f</i>
	4 126 <i>z</i> , 131 <i>h</i> N.,	
	135 <i>g</i>	
	6	113 <i>z</i>
	9	37 <i>f</i>
2	5	44 <i>o</i> , 117 <i>l</i>
	7	145 <i>e</i>
	12	159 <i>w</i>
	17 72 <i>v</i> , 117 <i>m</i> N.,	
	152 <i>n</i>	

Zechariah

1	2	117 <i>q</i>
	8	132 <i>d</i>
	13	131 <i>c</i>
	14	117 <i>q</i>
	17	72 <i>k</i>
2	8	118 <i>r</i>
	10	154 <i>b</i>
	11	29 <i>o</i> N.
	17	72 <i>v</i> , 72 <i>ee</i>
3	1	61 <i>b</i> , 115 <i>c</i>
	4	113 <i>z</i>
	7	53 <i>o</i>
	8	126 <i>e</i>
	9	88 <i>f</i> , 97 <i>c</i> , 122 <i>n</i>
4	2	91 <i>e</i> , 97 <i>c</i>
	7	126 <i>x</i>
	10 72 <i>dd</i> , 126 <i>w</i> , 127 <i>h</i>	
	12	10 <i>g</i> , 145 <i>m</i>
5	2	134 <i>n</i>
	3	75 <i>mm</i>
	4	73 <i>d</i> , 80 <i>i</i>
	7	74 <i>i</i>
	9	74 <i>k</i>
	10	32 <i>n</i>
	11 23 <i>k</i> , 72 <i>ee</i> , 103 <i>g</i>	
6	7	54 <i>k</i>
	10	49 <i>l</i>
	12	155 <i>e</i>
7	1	134 <i>p</i>
	5 59 <i>a</i> , 113 <i>z</i> , 117 <i>x</i> ,	
	135 <i>e</i> , 136 <i>d</i> N.	
	7	117 <i>l</i>

Zechariah

7	10	139 <i>c</i>
	14	52 <i>n</i>
8	2	117 <i>q</i>
	5	132 <i>d</i>
	6	150 <i>a</i>
	17	117 <i>l</i>
	23	157 <i>a</i>
9	5	75 <i>p</i> , 75 <i>hh</i>
	9 72 <i>s</i> , 124 <i>o</i> , 154 <i>a</i>	
	N.	
	11	135 <i>f</i> , 152 <i>u</i>
	12	116 <i>s</i>
10	2	124 <i>h</i>
	5	72 <i>p</i>
	6	72 <i>x</i>
11	2	126 <i>w</i>
	5	19 <i>k</i>
	7 96, 130 <i>g</i> , 132 <i>c</i> ,	
	133 <i>h</i>	
	10	67 <i>w</i>
	17	90 <i>l</i>
12	10	138 <i>e</i> N ¹
	12	123 <i>d</i>
13	7 72 <i>s</i> , 110 <i>k</i> , 144 <i>a</i>	
14	4	93 <i>v</i> , 128 <i>w</i> N.
	10	72 <i>p</i>
	12	67 <i>dd</i>

Malachi

1	2	68 <i>f</i>
	6	32 <i>c</i>
	10	151 <i>a</i> , 153
	13	37 <i>c</i> , 147 <i>c</i>
	14	80 <i>d</i> N.
2	5	67 <i>u</i>
	14	95 <i>k</i>
	15	144 <i>p</i>
	16	116 <i>s</i> , 155 <i>n</i>
3	1	150 <i>g</i>
	2	126 <i>k</i>
	9	67 <i>u</i> , 144 <i>p</i>
	14	100 <i>g</i>
	20	44 <i>d</i>

Psalms

1	2	119 <i>dd</i> , 163 <i>a</i>
	3 16 <i>g</i> , 107 <i>g</i> , 119 <i>cc</i>	
	6	68 <i>c</i>
2	1	106 <i>l</i>
	2	126 <i>h</i>
	3	91 <i>l</i> , 108 <i>b</i>
	4	126 <i>h</i>
	6 135 <i>a</i> , 135 <i>n</i> , 154 <i>b</i>	
	7	44 <i>d</i> , 69 <i>s</i>
	10	126 <i>h</i> , 154 <i>b</i>
	12	118 <i>g</i> N., 130 <i>a</i>
3	1	129 <i>c</i>
	2	67 <i>ee</i>

Psalms

3	3	90 <i>g</i> , 152 <i>n</i> N.
	5	144 <i>m</i>
	6	49 <i>e</i>
	8	72 <i>s</i> , 117 <i>ll</i>
4	1	124 <i>f</i>
	3 37 <i>e</i> , 47 <i>m</i> , 156 <i>d</i>	
	4	154 <i>b</i>
	7	76 <i>b</i>
	8	133 <i>e</i> N., 155 <i>l</i>
5	4	118 <i>i</i>
	5	116 <i>f</i> , 117 <i>bb</i>
	7	128 <i>a</i> , 128 <i>t</i>
	8	107 <i>s</i>
	9	24 <i>f</i> , 70 <i>b</i>
	10 122 <i>q</i> , 124 <i>e</i> , 145 <i>m</i> ,	
	152 <i>o</i>	
	11	29 <i>e</i>
	12	116 <i>g</i> , 156 <i>d</i>
	13	117 <i>ee</i>
6	2	152 <i>h</i>
	4	147 <i>c</i>
	6	152 <i>o</i>
	7	106 <i>g</i>
	10	142 <i>f</i>
7	3	152 <i>l</i>
	4	159 <i>m</i>
	5	49 <i>e</i>
	6	63 <i>n</i>
	7 72 <i>s</i> , 119 <i>gg</i> , 156 <i>d</i>	
	10 124 <i>g</i> , 132 <i>h</i> , 158 <i>a</i>	
	12	127 <i>b</i>
	13	120 <i>g</i>
	16	155 <i>h</i>
	17	10 <i>h</i>
8	2	66 <i>h</i>
	3	128 <i>a</i>
	4	159 <i>dd</i>
	5 107 <i>v</i> , 111 <i>m</i> , 150 <i>h</i>	
	6	117 <i>cc</i>
9	1	5 <i>h</i>
	2	13 <i>c</i>
	7	135 <i>f</i>
	11	106 <i>k</i>
	14	20 <i>b</i> , 63 <i>l</i>
	15	91 <i>l</i>
	16	138 <i>g</i>
	19	152 <i>z</i>
	21	157 <i>a</i>
10	1	5 <i>h</i>
	5	141 <i>c</i>
	9	91 <i>e</i>
	10	93 <i>x</i> , 154 <i>N.</i>
	11	106 <i>g</i>
	12	66 <i>c</i> , 76 <i>b</i>
11	1 118 <i>r</i> , 129 <i>c</i> , 148 <i>b</i>	
	2	47 <i>m</i>
	4	145 <i>u</i> , 155 <i>e</i>
	6	109 <i>k</i>
	7	103 <i>f</i>
12	2	123 <i>b</i>

Psalms		Psalms		Psalms	
12	3 . . . 117 <i>t</i> , 123 <i>f</i>	21	4 . . . 117 <i>ff</i>	34	2 . . . 21 <i>d</i>
	4 . . . 122 <i>q</i>		7 . . . 117 <i>ii</i> , 124 <i>e</i>		6 . . . 109 <i>e</i>
	7 . . . 109 <i>g</i> , 97 <i>h</i>		13 . . . 117 <i>ii</i> N., 156 <i>d</i>		9 . . . 155 <i>f</i>
	8 . . . 126 <i>y</i>	22	2 . . . 59 <i>h</i>		12 . . . 60 <i>f</i> , 126 <i>o</i>
	9 . . . 54 <i>k</i>		3 . . . 152 <i>d</i>	35	1 . . . 73 <i>d</i>
13	4 . . . 117 <i>r</i> N.		4 . . . 117 <i>bb</i>		8 . . . 156 <i>g</i>
	5 . . . 44 <i>e</i> , 59 <i>i</i> , 152 <i>z</i>		6 . . . 112 <i>h</i>		10 . . . 9 <i>u</i>
14	1 . . . 154 <i>a</i> N.		7 . . . 116 <i>l</i>		14 . . . 93 <i>hh</i>
	3 . . . 152 <i>o</i>		8 . . . 119 <i>q</i>		16 . . . 113 <i>h</i>
	5 . . . 117 <i>p</i>		9 . . . 144 <i>p</i>		19 . . . 131 <i>q</i> N.
	7 . . . 151 <i>b</i>	14	. . . 118 <i>r</i>	36	6 . . . 35 <i>n</i>
15	2 . . . 118 <i>n</i>		15 . . . 67 <i>t</i>		8 . . . 75 <i>u</i>
16	1 . . . 48 <i>i</i> , 61 <i>f</i> N.		16 . . . 121 <i>c</i> , 122 <i>n</i>		9 . . . 75 <i>u</i>
	2 . . . 44 <i>i</i> , 152 <i>t</i>		18 . . . 107 <i>s</i>		13 . . . 64 <i>d</i>
	3 . . . 130 <i>d</i> , 143 <i>e</i>		22 . . . 23 <i>f</i> , 119 <i>ff</i>	37	1 . . . 5 <i>h</i> , 35 <i>b</i> , 75 <i>bb</i>
	4 . . . 93 <i>m</i> , 145 <i>p</i> , 155 <i>f</i>		29 . . . 116 <i>s</i>		5 . . . 67 <i>n</i>
	5 . . . 50 <i>e</i>		32 . . . 116 <i>e</i>		9 . . . 20 <i>f</i>
	6 . . . 80 <i>g</i> , 122 <i>q</i>	23	2 . . . 124 <i>e</i> , 128 <i>p</i>		14 . . . 45 <i>g</i>
	8 . . . 116 <i>s</i>		4 . . . 107 <i>x</i> , 159 <i>bb</i>		15 . . . 20 <i>h</i>
	9 . . . 111 <i>r</i>		5 . . . 126 <i>m</i> , 141 <i>c</i> , 141 <i>d</i>		16 . . . 129 <i>b</i>
	10 . . . 114 <i>m</i>		6 . . . 69 <i>m</i> N.		20 . . . 29 <i>o</i> , 75 <i>m</i>
	11 . . . 122 <i>q</i> , 124 <i>e</i>	24	1 . . . 129 <i>c</i> , 130 <i>a</i>		23 . . . 121 <i>f</i>
17	3 . . . 59 <i>h</i>		2 . . . 107 <i>b</i> , 124 <i>e</i>		24 . . . 159 <i>bb</i>
	4 . . . 143 <i>e</i>		4 . . . 128 <i>y</i>		31 . . . 145 <i>k</i>
	5 . . . 113 <i>gg</i>	10	. . . 136 <i>c</i>	38	11 . . . 55 <i>e</i>
	9 . . . 138 <i>g</i>	25	1 . . . 5 <i>h</i>		13 . . . 124 <i>e</i>
	10 . . . 91 <i>f</i>		10 . . . 141 <i>c</i>		21 . . . 61 <i>c</i>
	12 . . . 126 <i>p</i>		11 . . . 112 <i>nn</i>	39	13 . . . 10 <i>h</i>
	13 . . . 144 <i>m</i>		14 . . . 114 <i>i</i>		14 . . . 75 <i>gg</i>
18	1 . . . 2 <i>s</i> , 53 <i>l</i> , 130 <i>d</i> , 154 <i>a</i> N.	26	2 . . . 48 <i>i</i>	40	2 . . . 75 <i>aa</i>
	3 . . . 93 <i>pp</i> , 155 <i>i</i>		3 . . . 112 <i>qq</i>		5 . . . 93 <i>oo</i>
	4 . . . 116 <i>e</i> , 132 <i>b</i>		4 . . . 128 <i>t</i>		6 . . . 108 <i>f</i>
	7 . . . 109 <i>g</i> N ^s , 107 <i>b</i>		10 . . . 53 <i>q</i>		15 . . . 29 <i>o</i> N.
	10 . . . 69 <i>p</i>		12 . . . 20 <i>f</i>	41	3 . . . 29 <i>q</i>
	12 . . . 109 <i>k</i>		12 . . . 93 <i>qq</i>		3 . . . 109 <i>e</i>
	17 . . . 117 <i>g</i>	27	7 . . . 144 <i>m</i>		5 . . . 74 <i>h</i>
	18 . . . 126 <i>z</i>		13 . . . 5 <i>n</i> , 159 <i>dd</i> , 167 <i>a</i>		6 . . . 111 <i>t</i>
	22 . . . 119 <i>ff</i>	28	1 . . . 119 <i>ff</i>		8 . . . 54 <i>f</i>
	26 . . . 93 <i>h</i> , 93 <i>s</i>		7 . . . 53 <i>q</i>	42	2 . . . 122 <i>f</i> , 155 <i>g</i>
	28 . . . 132 <i>f</i>		9 . . . 10 <i>g</i>		4 . . . 115 <i>e</i> N.
	30 . . . 67 <i>q</i> , 119 <i>o</i>	29	1 . . . 124 <i>g</i> , 128 <i>v</i>		5 . . . 117 <i>x</i>
	31 . . . 126 <i>c</i> , 140 <i>d</i> , 143 <i>a</i>		4 . . . 141 <i>c</i> N ²	10	. . . 68 <i>g</i> , 102 <i>l</i>
	33 . . . 116 <i>f</i> , 116 <i>x</i> , 117 <i>cc</i>	10	. . . 111 <i>r</i>	43	1 . . . 72 <i>s</i>
	35 . . . 145 <i>k</i>	30	2 . . . 60 <i>f</i>		2 . . . 102 <i>l</i>
	38 . . . 107 <i>c</i>		4 . . . 69 <i>m</i>		3 . . . 124 <i>b</i>
	40 . . . 116 <i>i</i>		8 . . . 90 <i>n</i> , 93 <i>aa</i>	44	3 . . . 144 <i>m</i>
	41 . . . 117 <i>ii</i> N.	31	2 . . . 108 <i>c</i>		6 . . . 119 <i>o</i>
	49 . . . 116 <i>i</i>	21	. . . 93 <i>r</i>	18	. . . 156 <i>f</i>
19	3 . . . 20 <i>f</i>	32	1 . . . 75 <i>qq</i> , 116 <i>k</i>		20 . . . 119 <i>q</i>
	4 . . . 49 <i>k</i>		2 . . . 155 <i>i</i>		23 . . . 128 <i>q</i>
	5 . . . 135 <i>p</i>		6 . . . 143 <i>e</i> , 153		26 . . . 67 <i>k</i>
	6 . . . 122 <i>o</i>		8 . . . 107 <i>g</i> , 138 <i>g</i> , 156 <i>c</i>		27 . . . 72 <i>s</i>
	8 . . . 114 <i>i</i>		9 . . . 114 <i>a</i> , 114 <i>k</i> , 114 <i>s</i>	45	1 . . . 124 <i>e</i>
	10 . . . 126 <i>b</i> , 141 <i>c</i>	33	5 . . . 116 <i>s</i>		3 . . . 55 <i>e</i>
	11 . . . 116 <i>e</i>		7 . . . 118 <i>w</i>		5 . . . 131 <i>c</i> , 154 <i>a</i> N.
	14 . . . 67 <i>p</i>		8 . . . 145 <i>e</i>		6 . . . 15 <i>o</i> , 29 <i>o</i> N.
20	3 . . . 135 <i>m</i>	10	. . . 67 <i>v</i>		7 . . . 128 <i>d</i>
	4 . . . 48 <i>d</i>	12	. . . 155 <i>h</i>		8 . . . 117 <i>ee</i>
21	2 . . . 109 <i>k</i> , 126 <i>h</i> , 148 <i>b</i>	15	. . . 126 <i>b</i>		9 . . . 87 <i>f</i> , 141 <i>d</i>
		34	1 . . . 5 <i>h</i>	10	. . . 20 <i>h</i> N ²

Psalms

45 12 75 *bb*, 109 *h*, 124 *i*
 16 76 *g*
 18 53 *q*, 123 *c*
 46 3 115 *g*
 4 132 *h* *N*.
 5 124 *b*, 132 *c*
 7 119 *q*
 48 6 164 *b* *N*.
 11 93 *g*, 93 *x*
 15 126 *aa*
 49 6 102 *l*
 7 126 *b*
 8 113 *v*
 14 155 *e*
 15 10 *g*, 67 *ee*, 114 *k*
N.
 50 3 109 *e*, 144 *c*
 4 115 *b*
 10 90 *n*
 12 159 *m*, 159 *r*
 17 142 *d*
 21 112 *cc*, 113 *x*, 157 *a*
 22 116 *b*
 23 58 *i*
 51 4 75 *gg*, 120 *g*
 5 142 *f*
 7 64 *h*
 9 165 *a*
 10 155 *h*
 14 117 *ff*
 18 108 *f*
 19 128 *h*
 52 5 119 *w*
 15 58 *i*
 53 6 91 *e*, 116 *i*
 54 6 119 *i*
 55 3 108 *g*
 10 52 *n*
 16 74 *k*
 18 108 *g*
 19 119 *gg*
 22 10 *g*
 23 117 *x*
 56 4 155 *l*
 57 2 75 *u*
 5 117 *bb*, 144 *m*
 58 2 52 *n*
 5 63 *n*
 9 69 *x*, 96, 118 *r*
 59 6 125 *h*, 128 *x*, 131 *s*
 8 151 *a*
 16 159 *s*
 60 4 75 *pp*
 5 131 *c*
 13 80 *g*, 158 *a*
 61 1 80 *f*
 8 75 *cc*
 62 4 52 *q*
 5 145 *m*
 8 13 *c*

Psalms

63 2 132 *d*
 4 60 *e*
 6 117 *t*
 64 5 69 *r*
 7 67 *e*
 8 117 *ff*
 9 130 *a*
 65 6 92 *g*
 10 53 *n*, 60 *g*
 11 117 *y*
 66 6 108 *g*
 13 119 *n*
 17 144 *m*
 68 3 19 *c*, 51 *k*, 67 *t*
 5 119 *i* *N*³, 122 *t*
 7 117 *bb*, 124 *e*
 9 136 *d* *N*.
 17 131 *c*
 18 21 *c*, 97 *h*
 19 20 *f*, 117 *bb*
 22 128 *c*
 23 75 *u*
 24 10 *g*, 103 *m*
 34 119 *g*
 69 4 118 *p*
 5 131 *q* *N*.
 9 48 *i*
 10 95 *b* *N*.
 11 144 *l* *N*³
 24 64 *h*
 33 69 *s*
 71 1 108 *c*
 7 131 *r*
 23 44 *o*
 72 2 107 *n*
 13 72 *r*
 14 69 *f*
 17 10 *g*
 20 52 *q*
 73 2 75 *u*
 7 145 *o*
 9 63 *n*, 69 *x*
 14 123 *c*
 16 49 *e*, 108 *e*
 17 108 *h*
 20 53 *q*, 119 *y* *N*.
 27 119 *ff*
 28 73 *d*
 74 7 119 *gg*
 8 76 *f*
 10 64 *e*
 19 80 *f*
 75 4 116 *w*, 146 *g*
 76 6 54 *a* *N*²
 11 124 *e*
 77 2 63 *o*
 4 75 *l*, 75 *u*
 10 67 *r*
 11 67 *r*
 16 20 *g*, 125 *c*

Psalms

77 18 55 *b*, 93 *bb*
 20 20 *h*
 78 6 107 *k*
 15 132 *h* *N*.
 16 74 *l*
 21 66 *e*
 44 75 *u*, 124 *e*
 54 138 *g*
 80 8 131 *s*
 11 52 *q*, 121 *d*
 14 5 *n*, 56
 15 125 *h*
 19 72 *t*
 81 9 109 *b*
 11 116 *f*
 83 12 131 *o*
 19 144 *l* *N*²
 84 9 125 *h*
 86 2 9 *v*, 48 *i* *N*.³, 61 *f* *N*.
 9 117 *n*
 87 3 121 *d* *N*¹, 145 *u*
 5 123 *c*
 88 5 152 *u*
 6 116 *h*
 17 55 *d*
 89 7 124 *q*, 128 *v*
 10 76 *b*
 40 64 *e*
 48 135 *f*
 51 132 *b*
 52 20 *h*
 90 2 107 *c*, 152 *r*
 3 109 *k*, 111 *t*
 4 118 *r*
 5 155 *g*
 6 112 *m*
 8 73 *d*
 10 49 *e*
 13 147 *c*
 15 87 *n*, 130 *d*
 91 4 67 *p*, 109 *k*
 6 67 *q*, 118 *i*
 9 117 *ii*
 11 20 *c*
 12 60 *e*
 92 12 132 *b*
 93 5 75 *x*
 94 1 53 *m*, 69 *v*
 9 93 *qq*
 12 20 *g*
 20 60 *b*, 63 *m*
 99 6 74 *i*, 75 *oo*, 119 *i*
 100 3 103 *g*
 101 5 55 *b*, 64 *i*, 90 *m*
 102 4 67 *u*
 9 116 *i*
 14 67 *cc*
 19 106 *e*
 28 67 *g*, 135 *a* *N*¹
 103 1 10 *g*

Psalms

103	3	.	.	.	91 <i>e</i> , 91 <i>l</i>
	4	.	.	.	58 <i>g</i>
	5	.	.	.	145 <i>k</i> , 156 <i>d</i>
	9	.	.	.	117 <i>g</i>
104	1	.	.	.	106 <i>g</i>
	3	.	.	.	20 <i>m</i> N ² , 35 <i>b</i> , 126 <i>b</i>
	8	.	.	.	138 <i>g</i>
	11	.	.	.	90 <i>n</i>
	12	.	.	.	93 <i>z</i>
	18	.	.	.	20 <i>m</i> , 126 <i>x</i>
	20	.	.	.	109 <i>h</i> , 159 <i>d</i>
	21	.	.	.	114 <i>p</i>
	25	.	.	.	136 <i>d</i>
	26	.	.	.	138 <i>g</i>
	28	.	.	.	47 <i>m</i> , 159 <i>c</i>
105	12	.	.	.	118 <i>x</i>
	28	.	.	.	53 <i>n</i>
	43	.	.	.	78 <i>l</i>
107	23	.	.	.	5 <i>n</i> , 17 <i>e</i>
	43	.	.	.	93 <i>m</i>
108	7	.	.	.	144 <i>m</i>
109	2	.	.	.	117 <i>t</i>
	3	.	.	.	57 N ²
	10	.	.	.	64 <i>e</i>
	13	.	.	.	75 <i>y</i>
110	1	.	.	.	164 <i>f</i>
	2	.	.	.	110 <i>c</i>
	3	.	.	.	141 <i>c</i>
	4	.	.	.	90 <i>l</i>
111	1	.	.	.	5 <i>h</i>
112	1	.	.	.	5 <i>h</i>
	8	.	.	.	164 <i>f</i>
	9	.	.	.	120 <i>g</i>
113	5	.	.	.	90 <i>m</i>
	7	.	.	.	90 <i>m</i>
	8	.	.	.	90 <i>n</i>
	9	.	.	.	90 <i>n</i>
114	1	.	.	.	128 <i>a</i> N ²
	8	.	.	.	90 <i>m</i> , 90 <i>n</i>
115	7	.	.	.	143 <i>d</i> , 147 <i>e</i>
116	1	.	.	.	90 <i>n</i>
	4	.	.	.	16 <i>f</i>
	6	.	.	.	53 <i>q</i>
	7	.	.	.	72 <i>s</i> , 91 <i>l</i>
	12	.	.	.	91 <i>l</i>
	15	.	.	.	90 <i>f</i>
118	5	.	.	.	20 <i>g</i> , 59 <i>f</i> , 119 <i>g</i>
	7	.	.	.	119 <i>i</i>
	10	.	.	.	60 <i>d</i>
	13	.	.	.	113 <i>p</i>
	14	.	.	.	80 <i>g</i>
	18	.	.	.	20 <i>g</i> , 59 <i>f</i>
	23	.	.	.	74 <i>g</i>
	25	.	.	.	53 <i>m</i>
	26	.	.	.	59 <i>e</i>
119	1	.	.	.	5 <i>n</i> , 75 <i>oo</i>
	18	.	.	.	75 <i>cc</i>
	28	.	.	.	91 <i>n</i>
	117	.	.	.	75 <i>l</i>

Psalms

119	128	.	.	.	130 <i>f</i> N.
	136	.	.	.	155 <i>n</i>
	137	.	.	.	145 <i>r</i>
120	1	.	.	.	90 <i>g</i> , 127 <i>e</i>
	5	.	.	.	117 <i>bb</i>
	6	.	.	.	119 <i>s</i>
	7	.	.	.	141 <i>c</i> N ³
121	1	.	.	.	127 <i>e</i>
	3	.	.	.	107 <i>p</i> , 109 <i>e</i>
	5	.	.	.	124 <i>k</i>
122	6	.	.	.	75 <i>u</i>
123	1	.	.	.	90 <i>m</i>
	4	.	.	.	119 <i>s</i> , 127 <i>g</i>
124	4	.	.	.	90 <i>f</i>
125	1	.	.	.	155 <i>g</i>
126	6	.	.	.	113 <i>p</i> , 113 <i>u</i>
127	1	.	.	.	118 <i>i</i>
	2	.	.	.	23 <i>l</i> , 80 <i>h</i> , 114 <i>n</i>
128	3	.	.	.	75 <i>v</i> , 96
	5	.	.	.	110 <i>i</i>
131	1	.	.	.	72 <i>l</i>
132	1	.	.	.	52 <i>r</i>
	3	.	.	.	128 <i>m</i>
	4	.	.	.	80 <i>g</i>
	12	.	.	.	34 <i>b</i> , 91 <i>n</i> , 138 <i>g</i>
133	2	.	.	.	126 <i>x</i>
135	7	.	.	.	53 <i>o</i>
136	1	.	.	.	2 <i>r</i>
	3	.	.	.	102 <i>m</i>
	6	.	.	.	65 <i>d</i>
137	1	.	.	.	124 <i>e</i>
	3	.	.	.	117 <i>gg</i>
	5	.	.	.	159 <i>m</i>
	6	.	.	.	58 <i>g</i>
	7	.	.	.	75 <i>cc</i> , 116 <i>d</i>
138	2	.	.	.	16 <i>f</i>
	6	.	.	.	69 <i>b</i> N., 69 <i>p</i>
139	1	.	.	.	59 <i>h</i>
	2	.	.	.	73 <i>a</i> N.
	5	.	.	.	91 <i>e</i>
	8	.	.	.	66 <i>e</i> , 159 <i>m</i>
	11	.	.	.	103 <i>d</i> , 111 <i>x</i> , 159 <i>f</i>
	12	.	.	.	133 <i>b</i> N ²
	14	.	.	.	75 <i>gg</i> , 118 <i>p</i>
	18	.	.	.	159 <i>c</i> N.
	20	.	.	.	23 <i>i</i> , 68 <i>h</i> , 75 <i>oo</i>
	21	.	.	.	72 <i>cc</i>
	22	.	.	.	117 <i>q</i> , 128 <i>r</i>
140	4	.	.	.	91 <i>l</i>
	10	.	.	.	75 <i>mm</i>
	13	.	.	.	44 <i>i</i>
141	3	.	.	.	20 <i>h</i> , 48 <i>i</i>
	4	.	.	.	96
	5	.	.	.	74 <i>k</i>
	8	.	.	.	75 <i>bb</i>
	10	.	.	.	145 <i>m</i>
142	5	.	.	.	113 <i>bb</i>
143	6	.	.	.	106 <i>g</i>
144	2	.	.	.	87 <i>f</i>
	14	.	.	.	122 <i>e</i>

Psalms

145	1	.	.	.	5 <i>h</i>
	7	.	.	.	132 <i>b</i>
	13	.	.	.	123 <i>c</i>
147	1	.	.	.	52 <i>p</i>
	2	.	.	.	20 <i>m</i>
149	2	.	.	.	124 <i>k</i>

Proverbs					
1	9	.	.	.	91 <i>n</i>
	10	.	.	.	68 <i>h</i> , 75 <i>hh</i>
	16	.	.	.	145 <i>u</i>
	19	.	.	.	29 <i>f</i>
	20	.	.	.	47 <i>k</i> , 48 <i>d</i> , 86 <i>l</i>
	21	.	.	.	75 <i>v</i>
	22	.	.	.	63 <i>m</i> , 93 <i>t</i> N.
	23	.	.	.	159 <i>d</i>
	28	.	.	.	60 <i>e</i>
2	8	.	.	.	114 <i>i</i> N.
	10	.	.	.	145 <i>u</i>
	11	.	.	.	58 <i>i</i>
	14	.	.	.	128 <i>w</i>
	19	.	.	.	116 <i>i</i>
	22	.	.	.	144 <i>g</i>
3	3	.	.	.	110 <i>f</i>
	8	.	.	.	22 <i>s</i>
	12	.	.	.	16 <i>b</i>
	25	.	.	.	109 <i>e</i>
	26	.	.	.	119 <i>i</i>
4	4	.	.	.	75 <i>n</i>
	8	.	.	.	60 <i>f</i> , 67 <i>l</i>
	13	.	.	.	20 <i>h</i>
	21	.	.	.	72 <i>ee</i>
	25	.	.	.	70 <i>b</i>
5	2	.	.	.	145 <i>u</i>
	4	.	.	.	96
	6	.	.	.	72 <i>l</i>
	13	.	.	.	75 <i>ee</i>
	16	.	.	.	150 <i>a</i>
	17	.	.	.	152 <i>o</i>
	22	.	.	.	60 <i>e</i> , 131 <i>m</i> N.
6	24	.	.	.	114 <i>i</i> N., 128 <i>w</i>
7	2	.	.	.	75 <i>n</i>
	5	.	.	.	114 <i>i</i> N.
	7	.	.	.	108 <i>h</i>
	8	.	.	.	91 <i>e</i>
	11	.	.	.	94 <i>d</i>
	13	.	.	.	67 <i>ad</i> , 68 <i>e</i>
	26	.	.	.	116 <i>l</i>
8	3	.	.	.	47 <i>k</i>
	4	.	.	.	96
	12	.	.	.	117 <i>bb</i>
	13	.	.	.	122 <i>v</i>
	17	.	.	.	68 <i>f</i>
	22	.	.	.	59 <i>f</i>
	25	.	.	.	107 <i>c</i> , 152 <i>r</i>
	26	.	.	.	124 <i>l</i>
	27	.	.	.	67 <i>r</i>
	28	.	.	.	93 <i>v</i>
	30	.	.	.	122 <i>f</i>

Proverbs

8 32 . . . 130 *d*, 155 *n*
 9 1 86 *l*
 5 119 *m*
 9 109 *h*
 10 124 *h*
 12 159 *ff*
 13 . 137 *c*, 152 *u* *N*.
 18 116 *l*
 10 4 . 23 *g*, 72 *p*, 117 *t*
 26 124 *k*
 31 117 *z*
 11 3 67 *n*
 14 123 *b*
 15 67 *t*
 21 22 *s*
 25 69 *w*
 12 1 16 *f*
 10 145 *h*
 17 159 *c*
 18 75 *qq*
 19 108 *h*
 28 152 *g*
 13 4 131 *n*
 6 142 *f*
 10 153
 21 117 *c*
 23 23 *g*
 24 117 *ff*
 14 1 . . 86 *l*, 145 *k* *N*.
 2 116 *k*
 3 47 *g*
 7 152 *u* *N*.
 10 22 *s*
 13 131 *n* *N*¹
 14 72 *p*
 20 121 *f*
 30 124 *d*
 34 72 *bb*
 35 114 *i* *N*.
 15 1 20 *c*, 22 *s*
 5 63 *n*
 20 107 *f*
 16 3 124 *e*
 4 127 *i*
 11 128 *a* *N*.
 30 141 *i* *N*.
 33 121 *b*
 17 4 68 *i*
 10 66 *f*
 12 113 *cc*, 133 *b* *N*.
 152 *g*
 15 154 *a* *N*. (*c*)
 21 114 *i* *N*.
 26 153
 18 6 145 *u*
 16 92 *g*
 22 159 *h*
 24 47 *b*
 19 7 9 *u*
 8 114 *i*

Proverbs

19 25 . . . 63 *n*, 144 *h*
 20 2 128 *h*
 9 107 *t*
 10 123 *f*
 13 110 *h*
 16 63 *l*
 22 22 *s*
 25 114 *i*
 21 6 128 *c*
 12 125 *c*
 22 21 10 *k*, 124 *k*, 131 *c*
 23 1 73 *a*, 73 *d*
 7 152 *t*
 22 138 *g*
 24 159 *i*
 29 131 *q*
 35 120 *c*
 24 1 5 *h*
 4 29 *o*
 14 48 *l*
 17 51 *l*
 22 151 *a*
 31 117 *z*
 25 3 53 *k*
 3 29 *i* *N*.
 5 126 *n*
 9 75 *bb*
 11 93 *r*
 12 161 *a* *N*.
 13 124 *k*
 16 76 *h*, 91 *d*
 17 69 *v*
 19 . 52 *s*, 67 *s*, 92 *g*
 23 72 *bb*
 26 53 *s*
 27 113 *b*
 26 7 75 *u*
 8 67 *cc*
 17 155 *e*
 23 145 *u*
 28 122 *n*
 27 6 63 *c*
 7 143 *a*
 9 146 *e*
 15 75 *x*
 24 150 *g* *N*.
 25 20 *h*
 28 6 88 *e* *N*.
 22 10 *h*
 29 6 67 *q*
 30 1 96
 3 124 *h*, 166 *a*
 6 10 *k*, 69 *v*
 13 72 *l*
 14 114 *i* *N*.
 17 . 10 *g* *N*.
 18 134 *s*
 24 133 *g*
 28 144 *h*
 30 152 *b*

Proverbs

30 31 35 *m*
 31 1 128 *h*
 2 37 *f*
 3 53 *q*, 87 *e*
 4 75 *n*
 10 2 *r*, 5 *h*
 30 54 *g*

Job

1 1 155 *e*, 156 *b*
 3 123 *a*
 4 97 *c*, 112 *dd*
 5 107 *e*, 112 *f*, 118 *h*
 164 *d*
 6 119 *cc*, 126 *s*, 128 *v*
 7 107 *h*
 12 136 *d*
 14 116 *r*, 119 *cc*, 122 *c*,
 135 *o*, 141 *i*, 145 *c*
 15 . 49 *e*, 122 *i*, 135 *o*
 16 116 *u*, 164 *a*
 18 116 *u*
 19 122 *g*
 21 . 23 *f*, 74 *k*, 118 *n*
 1 128 *v*
 3 111 *l*
 9 110 *f*, 150 *b*
 10 150 *a*, 153
 3 2 68 *e*
 3 29 *e*, 68 *d*, 107 *k*,
 155 *f*, 155 *i*
 4 141 *c* *N*.
 6 75 *r*
 8 114 *m*
 9 . 109 *a* *N*.
 11 152 *k*
 13 . . 106 *p*, 159 *dd*
 15 155 *e*
 17 106 *l*
 19 135 *a* *N*.
 20 128 *y*
 24 145 *p*
 25 75 *u*
 4 2 . 28 *b*, 87 *e*, 150 *m*
 3 107 *e*, 132 *f*
 5 111 *t*, 144 *b*
 6 143 *d*
 7 136 *c*
 17 107 *f*, 133 *b* *N*.
 150 *h*
 19 144 *g*
 20 . 29 *l*, 67 *g*, 67 *y*
 21 150 *m*
 5 1 61 *h*, 91 *d*
 2 117 *n*
 3 135 *a*
 5 119 *e*
 7 128 *v*, 161 *a*
 8 107 *x*

Job

5	10	126 b
12		166 a
13		91 e
14		118 u
16		90 g
18		75 qq
19		134 s
22		109 e
24		159 g
27		20 g
6	2	113 w, 144 g
	5	150 h
	7	66 b, 106 g
	8	95 h, 151 d
	9	120 d
	10	108 f
	12	141 d, 150 f
	13	150 g N.
	16	126 b
	17	130 d, 155 l
	19	119 s
	20	135 p, 145 u
	21	75 t, 152 a
	22	22 p, 64 a, 69 o
	25	154 a
	26	65 f, 69 v
	28	120 g
7	2	155 g
	3	121 c, 144 g
	4	124 f
	6	133 b
	13	112 hh, 119 m
	14	58 i, 60 d
	15	133 b
	18	123 c
	20	102 l, 119 aa, 159 h
	21	37 f
8	5	159 r
	7	145 u
	9	141 d
	10	125 c
	11	75 rr, 150 h, 152 a N.
	14	72 r, 93 oo
	18	29 g, 64 g
	19	145 d
	21	23 e, 75 pp
9	6	54 k
	7	109 g, 165 a
	8	87 s
	11	117 n, 159 w
	15	55 b, 159 n, 160 a
	16	111 x
	18	20 h, 114 m
	19	147 b
	20	53 n, 107 x
	22	106 i
	24	150 l N.
	26	155 g, 161 a N.
	27	159 u

Job

9	29	107 n
	31	126 r
	32	116 s, 152 d, 166 a
	33	109 i, 152 d
	34	60 d
10	1	72 dd
	7	119 aa N.
	8	111 e
	15	159 ff
	16	109 h, 120 g
	17	154 a N.
	18	107 n
	19	17 n
	21	107 c
	22	90 g, 152 a N.
11	2	128 t
	3	111 t
	5	151 b
	6	110 i, 134 r N.
	9	91 e
	11	128 t
	12	51 g, 131 e N.
	15	119 w, 159 ee
	17	48 d, 108 e, 133 e 144 c
	20	103 m
12	3	152 d
	4	111 u
	6	29 t, 75 u, 124 e
	7	145 k
	11	135 i, 161 a
	12	141 d
	14	159 w
	15	15 c
	17	116 s, 116 x, 118 o
	23	117 n
	24	128 a, 152 u
13	3	53 k, 113 d
	7	150 h
	9	53 k
	13	119 ff, 137 c
	15	153
	16	152 e
	17	113 r
	21	29 g, 60 d, 64 h
	25	117 c
	26	124 e
	27	54 f, 93 r
	28	144 p, 155 h
14	1	116 l
	2	111 s
	3	150 b, 153
	4	151 b
	6	109 f, 156 g
	9	65 e, 112 m
	10	111 t
	11	161 a
	19	145 k
	22	153
15	3	113 h, 119 hh

Job

15	6	145 u
	7	121 d
	10	131 g
	11	133 c
	13	125 c
	15	67 ee
	16	116 e
	17	75 bb, 138 h, 143 d
	20	146 a
	21	118 f
	22	75 v
	23	147 c
	26	128 r
18	3	150 g
	4	103 l, 108 f, 119 g
	5	60 f
	6	63 f, 108 e, 159 ff
	7	53 p, 75 ee, 144 p
	8	120 c
	9	118 g, 119 g
	10	54 k, 119 g
	12	112 tt
	13	95 h
	14	126 p
	16	44 m, 55 e
	17	152 a N., 160 a
	19	124 b
	22	69 x, 75 u, 145 u
17	1	124 c
	2	20 h, 73 e, 75 ff
	4	72 cc
	5	75 w
	7	75 p
	9	10 h
	10	120 e, 135 r
	13	124 b
	16	47 k
18	2	130 a
	3	75 qq
	4	51 n, 139 f
	7	67 dd, 135 n
	8	54 k
	12	109 k
	18	144 g
	21	130 d
19	2	21 d, 60 e, 75 gg, 75 oo
	3	53 n, 120 c
	7	63 h N., 159 w
	10	69 p, x
	15	60 a
	17	67 ee
	18	159 e
	19	138 h
	23	53 u, 67 y, 126 s, 151 d
	24	51 m
	25	118 n
	26	119 w, 144 g
	28	117 n

Job

20 4 150 *e*
 9 122 *l*
 10 72 *k*
 12 159 *q*
 17 . . . 109 *e*, 130 *e*
 19 . . . 154 *a* N.
 22 . . . 74 *h*, 118 *e*
 23 . . . 103 *f* N.
 24 159 *c*
 26 . 68 *f*, 145 *u*, 156 *f*
 29 . . . 131 *c*, 135 *m*
 21 4 100 *n*, 135 *f*, 143 *a*,
 150 *g*
 5 67 *v*
 7 117 *z*
 9 . 119 *w*, 141 *c* N^s
 11 52 *n*
 13 . . . 20 *i*, 66 *f*
 16 . 20 *f*, 106 *n* N²
 17 150 *h*
 21 . . . 37 *d*, 146 *a*
 22 142 *d*
 23 139 *g*
 25 119 *m*
 27 155 *k*
 29 . . . 44 *d*, 64 *f*
 32 124 *c*
 22 2 . . . 103 *f* N^s
 3 67 *y*
 7 152 *e*
 9 121 *b*
 12 20 *i*, 117 *h*, 141 *c*,
 158 *a*
 16 . . . 121 *d*, 149 *a*
 18 . . . 106 *n* N.
 20 . . . 91 *f*, 149 *e*
 21 48 *d*, 110 *f*, 135 *p*
 23 159 *f*
 29 23 *f*
 30 152 *q*
 23 2 119 *aa*
 3 120 *e*
 6 100 *l*
 9 109 *k*
 11 76 *c*
 12 143 *d*
 13 119 *i*
 16 67 *v*
 24 1 . . . 75 *m*, 121 *f*
 5 . . . 118 *r*, 145 *m*
 7 118 *o*
 10 . . . 118 *o*, 152 *u*
 14 109 *k*, 118 *x*, 120 *c*
 19 161 *a*
 21 70 *d*
 22 . . . 87 *e*, 156 *f*
 23 91 *l*
 24 . 51 *m*, 67 *m*, 67 *y*
 25 . 150 *l* N., 152 *a*
 25 2 116 *z*

Job

25 3 91 *d*
 5 67 *ee*
 28 2 152 *a* N., 152 *u*,
 152 *v*
 4 117 *gg*
 5 119 *c*
 7 116 *s*
 9 56
 14 119 *m*
 27 3 128 *e*
 5 149 *a*
 6 . . . 119 *w* N.
 7 118 *x*
 12 117 *q*
 19 . 68 *h*, 120 *d* N.
 23 . . . 103 *f* N.
 28 1 155 *h*
 2 . . . 121 *d*, 127 *ii*
 4 126 *b*
 5 118 *w*
 6 124 *l*
 11 119 *x*
 12 119 *ff*
 17 152 *z*
 25 114 *r*
 27 60 *d*
 29 2 118 *u*, 130 *d*, 151 *b*
 3 67 *p*, 118 *h*, 131 *o*
 6 23 *f*
 8 120 *g* N.
 10 . . . 44 *c*, 146 *a*
 12 . . . 152 *u*, 155 *n*
 15 141 *d*
 16 . . . 130 *d*, 155 *n*
 21 . 20 *i*, 24 *e*, 67 *g*
 23 118 *w*
 25 . . . 10 *g*, 126 *p*
 30 3 . . . 126 *b*, 133 *l*
 6 . . . 114 *k*, 133 *h*
 10 106 *g*
 13 . . . 152 *u*, 155 *n*
 14 75 *u*
 15 121 *b*
 19 . . . 59 *f*, 75 *ll*
 20 72 *bb*
 26 . . . 49 *e*, 108 *e*
 28 . . . 118 *n*, 120 *c*
 31 1 148 *a*
 5 72 *ff*
 7 . . . 23 *c*, 108 *f*
 9 159 *m*
 10 87 *e*
 11 . . . 32 *l*, 131 *s*
 12 155 *f*
 15 . . . 58 *k*, 72 *cc*
 18 117 *x*, 126 *p*, 163 *b*
 22 91 *e*
 26 67 *p*, 111 *q*, 118 *n*,
 118 *q*
 27 75 *q*

Job

31 28 159 *dd*
 29 112 *e*
 31 151 *b*
 34 156 *f*
 35 151 *b*
 32 6 . . . 68 *e*, 69 *m*
 7 146 *a*
 11 68 *i*
 12 103 *o*
 17 63 *f*
 18 . . . 23 *f*, 74 *k*
 22 120 *c*
 33 4 . . . 16 *k*, 75 *mm*
 5 . . . 48 *i*, 54 *k*
 21 . . . 14 *d*, 64 *e*
 25 56
 30 . . . 51 *l*, 72 *v*
 32 61 *d*
 34 13 90 *f*
 18 . . . 113 *ee* N.
 22 115 *g*
 36 159 *cc*
 35 10 124 *k*
 11 68 *k*
 15 152 *k*
 36 2 65 *e*
 7 . . . 111 *b* N.
 18 145 *u*
 32 122 *o*
 36 143 *d*
 37 5 118 *p*
 6 75 *hh*
 12 90 *f*
 14 117 *w*
 16 124 *e*
 18 150 *b*
 24 59 *i*
 38 2 136 *c*
 3 126 *p*
 5 159 *dd*
 6 137 *b*
 7 . . . 67 *n*, 128 *v*
 12 . . . 119 *w* N.
 13 . . . 5 *n*, 114 *r*
 14 . . . 118 *w*, 134 *r*
 16 150 *h*
 18 . . . 122 *g*, 150 *b*
 19 155 *k*
 21 . . . 107 *c*, 146 *a*
 24 165 *a*
 26 . . . 152 *u*, 155 *e*
 27 133 *l*
 28 150 *g*
 30 118 *w*
 32 145 *m*
 39 1 64 *d*
 2 . . . 91 *f*, 150 *b*
 3 135 *o*
 9 22 *s*
 13 150 *f*

Job

39	15	135 p
	17	119 m
	24	75 oo
	26	53 n
	30	55 f
40	2	113 ee, 113 gg
	5	134 r, 134 s
	8	150 g
	19	116 g N., 127 l
	22	67 n
	23	159 w
	24	66 f
	25	150 a N ¹
	30	150 b
	32	69 v
41	1	93 ss, 150 a N ¹
	2	72 cc
	4	103 g, 124 e
	7	118 r
	12	154 a N.
	15	156 g
	17	76 b
	20	128 v
	22	133 h
	25	24 b, 75 v, 126 b
	26	16 f, 117 a N ⁴
42	2	44 i
	3	133 d, 156 f
	5	75 mm
	7	164 d
	8	163 d
	10	91 k
	13	97 c
	15	135 o, 145 o
	16	75 t

Canticle

1	1	133 i
	6	60 a, 75 x
	7	36, 75 v
	8	20 h
	10	75 x, 141 c
	15	141 d
	7	144 a
	12	85 u N.
	13	141 d
	14	69 v, 93 ss
	17	119 s
3	7	131 n
	8	50 f
	11	75 n
5	5	135 b
	8	137 b N.
	9	59 h
	16	85 g N., 141 c
6	8	32 n
	11	67 dd
7	1	137 b N.
	2	93 x

Canticle

7	10	126 x, 133 h
8	2	87 f, 131 c N.
	4	137 b N.
	5	59 g N.
	6	93 m
	10	74 i
	14	119 s

Ruth

1	1	49 b N.
	8	135 o, 144 a
	9	46 f, 74 h, 74 k, 110 i
	12	106 p, 107 x
	13	51 m, 103 f N., 152 g
	14	76 b
	16	138 e
	19	91 f
	20	46 f, 80 h
	21	118 n
	22	32 n, 138 k
2	2	10 h, 64 i
	3	129 d
	6	138 k
	8	47 g, 47 o
	9	75 qq, 112 kk
	14	53 n, 66 c, 69 v, 103 g
	15	35 k
	16	67 o
	20	121 f
	21	47 o, 122 g
3	2	91 f, 141 c
	3	44 h, 104 g
	4	47 o, 109 k, 112 z
	6	59 g
	12	163 d
	14	107 c
	15	64 c, 69 o, 134 n
	18	163 c and N.
4	1	69 p, 72 t
	3	129 h, 138 k
	4	29 i N., 152 o
	7	112 h
	15	59 g

Lamentations

1	1	5 h, 90 l
	4	69 t, 87 e
	8	67 y, 72 ee, 117 p
	10	120 c, 155 f
	14	130 d, 155 n
	16	75 v, 117 z
	19	107 q, 165 a
2	7	64 e
	11	51 l
	16	15 c

Lamentations

2	18	80 f
3	1	144 p
	5	53 n
	12	80 h
	14	87 f
	22	20 o
	26	100 g N., 107 q
	33	69 u
	48	29 q, 69 p, 117 z
	50	109 k
	53	69 u
4	1	54 k, 75 rr
	2	75 rr
	5	117 n
	14	51 h, 120 g
	17	100 o
	21	90 n
5	5	72 ee N., 121 a
	10	145 u

Ecclesiastes

1	1	122 r
	4	116 l
	6	113 u
	9	137 c
	12	133 i
	13	112 pp N.
	16	135 b
	17	86 l
2	1	135 b
	5	112 pp N.
	7	145 u
	8	122 v
	13	24 e, 133 b
	15	93 rr, 135 e
	19	150 g
	20	64 e
	21	131 m
	22	36
	26	75 oo
3	2	2 s
	4	114 b
	10	131 n
	11	152 y
	14	165 b
	15	114 i
	18	36, 67 p
	19	93 rr
	21	100 m, 150 i N.
	22	102 k
4	2	113 gg
	3	117 l
	10	124 o
	14	35 d
	17	133 e
5	5	53 q
	6	143 d
	7	124 h
	8	32 l

Ecclesiastes

5	11	69 <i>n</i>
	14	109 <i>i</i>
	15	161 <i>b</i>
	16	147 <i>e</i>
	18	. 112 <i>pp N.</i> , 141 <i>h</i>	
7	7	117 <i>c</i>
	16	. 54 <i>c</i> , 54 <i>k</i> , 131 <i>q</i>	
	24	133 <i>k</i>
	26	75 <i>oo</i>
	27	122 <i>r</i>
■	1	35 <i>n</i> , 75 <i>rr</i>
	10	. 54 <i>g</i> , 119 <i>ii</i> , 128 <i>w N.</i>	
9	1	93 <i>uw</i>
	4	143 <i>e</i>
	12	52 <i>s</i>
	14	112 <i>pp N.</i>
10	5	75 <i>qq</i> , 155 <i>h</i>
	15	145 <i>m</i>
	17	91 <i>l</i>
	18	88 <i>b</i>
	20	53 <i>n</i>
11	2	134 <i>s</i>
	3	23 <i>i</i> , 75 <i>s</i>
12	1	124 <i>k</i>
	4	72 <i>t</i> , 128 <i>v</i>
	5	73 <i>g</i>
	6	67 <i>q</i> , 67 <i>t</i>
	7	109 <i>k</i>
	10	145 <i>h</i>

Esther

1	4	93 <i>ww</i>
	5	74 <i>h</i>
	8	123 <i>c</i>
	17	93 <i>m</i>
2	9	75 <i>v</i>
	11	123 <i>c</i>
3	4	157 <i>c</i>
	8	100 <i>o N.</i>
4	2	114 <i>l</i>
	8	93 <i>ww</i>
6	13	20 <i>g</i>
7	2	109 <i>f</i>
	5	74 <i>g</i> , 137 <i>a</i>
	8	114 <i>i</i>
8	1	137 <i>c</i>
	8	63 <i>c</i>
9	1	135 <i>a N.</i>
	6	113 <i>z</i>
	7	2 <i>s</i>
	23	124 <i>e</i> , 145 <i>o N.</i>

Daniel

1	4	23 <i>c</i> , 128 <i>a N.</i>
	5	135 <i>o</i>
	10	93 <i>ss</i>
	12	75 <i>cc</i>
	13	75 <i>hh</i>

Daniel

1	15	93 <i>ss</i>
2	1	124 <i>o</i>
	4	1 <i>c</i>
3	15	167 <i>a</i>
8	3	93 <i>n</i>
	9	135 <i>o</i>
	11	72 <i>ee</i>
	13	. 125 <i>b</i> , 126 <i>z</i> , 127 <i>f</i>	
	22	. 47 <i>k</i> , 87 <i>i</i> , 95 <i>u</i> , 116 <i>w</i>	
■	5	91 <i>n</i>
	13	117 <i>m</i>
	19	48 <i>i</i>
11	6	. 116 <i>f</i> , 127 <i>i</i> , 139 <i>h</i>	
	11	131 <i>n</i>
	20	93 <i>dd</i>
	23	53 <i>l</i> , 54 <i>k</i>
	35	53 <i>q</i>
12	2	102 <i>b</i> , 124 <i>e</i>
	7	93 <i>aa N.</i>
	11	134 <i>g</i>
	13	87 <i>e</i>

Ezra

2	62	131 <i>r</i>
	69	97 <i>g</i>
3	3	124 <i>q</i> , 147 <i>a</i>
	6	134 <i>p</i>
	12	126 <i>aa</i>
4	7	55 <i>h</i>
	8	1 <i>c</i>
6	21	8 <i>k</i>
7	12	1 <i>c</i>
	28	49 <i>e</i>
8	1	64 <i>i</i>
	18	14 <i>d</i>
	23	51 <i>n</i>
	25	93 <i>oo</i> , 138 <i>i</i>
	29	127 <i>g</i>
	30	92 <i>g</i>
	36	112 <i>rr</i>
9	6	22 <i>s</i>
10	13	141 <i>d</i>
	14	127 <i>i</i> , 138 <i>i</i>
	16	45 <i>g</i>
	17	127 <i>c N.</i>

Nehemiah

2	3	67 <i>dd</i>
	7	68 <i>g</i>
	12	131 <i>e</i> , 137 <i>c</i>
	13	5 <i>n</i>
3	8	124 <i>o</i> , 128 <i>v</i>
	13	35 <i>d</i>
	31	128 <i>v</i>
4	3	49 <i>e N.</i> , 53 <i>n</i>
	4	119 <i>m</i>
	7	20 <i>h</i>

Nehemiah

4	9	49 <i>e N.</i> , 67 <i>x</i>
	12	116 <i>k N.</i>
	17	152 <i>n</i>
5	14	91 <i>e</i>
6	6	90 <i>k</i>
	8	23 <i>c</i> , 74 <i>i</i>
	10	144 <i>i</i>
	11	100 <i>m</i>
7	2	118 <i>x</i>
	64	64 <i>i</i>
	66	23 <i>i</i>
■	2	74 <i>l</i>
	8	2 <i>t</i>
	10	. 85 <i>g N.</i> , 128 <i>p</i> , 152 <i>v</i> , 155 <i>n</i>	
	11	105 <i>a</i>
9	13	132 <i>d</i>
	35	126 <i>x</i>
10	37	123 <i>r N.</i>
	39	53 <i>k</i>
11	17	53 <i>q</i>
12	44	95 <i>n</i>
	47	95 <i>n</i>
13	9	165 <i>a</i>
	13	53 <i>g</i> , 53 <i>n</i>
	16	9 <i>b</i>
	21	73 <i>f</i>
	24	2 <i>a</i> , 2 <i>w</i>

1 Chronicles

2	13	47 <i>b</i>
	30	152 <i>u</i>
	48	145 <i>u</i>
3	5	69 <i>t</i>
4	10	61 <i>a</i> , 167 <i>a</i>
	42	131 <i>n</i>
■	1	114 <i>k</i>
	2	141 <i>a</i>
	20	63 <i>c</i>
6	63	90 <i>f</i>
7	5	124 <i>q</i>
8	8	52 <i>o</i>
	38	29 <i>q</i>
9	13	128 <i>c</i>
	22	135 <i>a N</i> ¹ , 155 <i>d</i>
	25	134 <i>m</i>
	27	123 <i>c</i>
	33	147 <i>a</i>
10	2	53 <i>r</i>
	13	114 <i>k</i>
11	6	116 <i>w</i>
	39	23 <i>f</i>
12	2	24 <i>f N.</i> , 70 <i>b</i>
	8	114 <i>b</i>
	17	61 <i>c</i>
	23	155 <i>d</i>
	33	123 <i>f</i>
	38	23 <i>f</i>
15	8	127 <i>f</i>

1 Chronicles

15	12	155 <i>n</i>
19		131 <i>a</i>
24	53	0, 55 <i>e</i>
26		63 <i>i</i>
27	56,	127 <i>g</i>
16	8	2 <i>s</i>
19	8	131 <i>b</i>
20	8	69 <i>t</i>
21	1	125 <i>f</i>
17		141 <i>h</i> N.
22	7	143 <i>a</i> N.
23	6	63 <i>n</i>
26		114 <i>k</i>
24	3	63 <i>n</i>
26	28	138 <i>i</i>
27	12	127 <i>d</i>
28	2	143 <i>a</i> N.
11		96
29	1	155 <i>d</i>
3		155 <i>n</i>
8		138 <i>i</i>
33		65 <i>f</i>

2 Chronicles

1	4	138 <i>i</i> , 155 <i>n</i>
2	12	117 <i>n</i>
3	17	126 <i>k</i>

2 Chronicles

4	3	123 <i>a</i> N.
5	11	114 <i>k</i>
8	18	93 <i>r</i>
11	22	114 <i>k</i> , 147 <i>a</i>
15	3	147 <i>a</i>
16	4	125 <i>h</i>
9		155 <i>n</i>
10		147 <i>a</i>
12		75 <i>rr</i> , 147 <i>a</i>
14		124 <i>c</i>
17	11	93 <i>x</i>
18	3	147 <i>a</i>
23		155 <i>d</i>
26		131 <i>c</i>
19	2	114 <i>k</i>
6		147 <i>a</i>
20	1	102 <i>b</i>
19		128 <i>v</i>
22		155 <i>l</i>
34		63 <i>p</i>
35		54 <i>a</i> N.
21	4	119 <i>w</i> N.
17		133 <i>g</i>
22	5	35 <i>d</i>
23	1	117 <i>n</i>
25	17	156 <i>c</i> N.
26	5	114 <i>c</i>
10		22 <i>s</i>

2 Chronicles

26	15	75 <i>rr</i> , 114 <i>n</i> , 126 <i>z</i>
18		114 <i>l</i>
28	10	142 <i>f</i> N.
21		147 <i>a</i>
23		53 <i>o</i>
29	6	67 <i>y</i>
10		165 <i>a</i>
17		134 <i>p</i>
18		117 <i>n</i>
27		155 <i>l</i>
30	9	114 <i>p</i> , 147 <i>a</i>
17		155 <i>d</i>
18		130 <i>d</i> N ²
19		155 <i>n</i>
31	7	69 <i>n</i> , 71, 142 <i>f</i> N ²
10		121 <i>d</i> N ¹
17		117 <i>m</i>
32	9	101 <i>a</i>
13		8 <i>k</i>
30		69 <i>u</i>
34	10	45 <i>g</i>
11		16 <i>f</i>
12		10 <i>h</i>
35	4	93 <i>ww</i>
21		109 <i>g</i> , 135 <i>g</i> , 147 <i>a</i>
23		69 <i>r</i>
36	23	137 <i>c</i>

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

8682

OXFORD: HORACE HART M.A.
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

